UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Unitas Association — English Language Edition

Vol. IV — JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1952 — No. 3

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.
The Church of Jesus Christ

JOSEPH GILL, S.J.
The Church in Anglican Theology

T. BOWYER CAMPBELL
Device for the Alteration of Religion

PETER ANSON
Lex Orandi — Lex Credendi

MARTIN JUGIE, A.A.
Catholics and Dissident Orientals

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
Bishop of Mainz on the "Ecumenical Movement"
A Dutch Lutheran on Evangelical "Catholicity"

NEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N.Y.

Imprimatur:

✠ Aloysius Traglia

Archiepus Caesarien Vicegerens

May 22, 1951

The Church of Jesus Christ

On the Occasion of the World Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, 1952

As has already been reported in the pages of Unitas, the Faith and Order Commission will hold an important conference at Lund in Sweden. This Commission is none other than the ecumenical movement of the same name which was united with the Life and Work movement at the Amsterdam Assembly of 1948 for the definitive establishment of the World Council of Churches. These two movements retain a certain autonomy within the Council. The Faith and Order Commission differs from the other by reason of its major concern for doctrinal matters. It understands that real progress in unity among the various Christian communities cannot be made without an ever greater accord on the truths which must be believed.

A considerable number of delegates (several hundred) will represent millions of Christians, especially Protestants and Anglicans, along with some groups of separated Orientals. The Patriarch of Moscow will not be represented, nor will the Churches depending upon him. This time the Catholic hierarchy has consented to appoint observers who have been chosen from Sweden. They are Msgr. David Assarson, Fr. de Pailleret, O.P., and Fr. Gerlach, S.J.

The principal subject announced for Lund is the Nature of the Church, and it is a capital one.

With the will to be as closely united as possible with this gathering of Christians in search of greater light, we are presenting here some reflections from the Catholic point of view on the Church founded by our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a good thing for Catholics to keep vivid and precise the knowledge that the Church has of herself; perhaps, too, these few lines could in some way be of service to some one or another of our separated brethren.

* * * *

Did our Lord Jesus Christ found a Church, that is, did He will and actually found an institution entrusted with the preservation and the spreading of His teaching, which should serve as the instrument for His activities exercised upon earth from Heaven, and which would enjoy the fruit acquired by His redeeming death? This has been denied in two opposing ways: by Harnack, who left nothing in the Gospel but the preaching of an interior, filial, and confident sentiment towards the divine Paternity; and by Loisy, who left nothing in this same Gospel but the announcement of the Parousia, the glorious coming of the Son of Man and the end of all things. Today there seems to be a general accord on the rejection of both systems, and on the reading of the Gospel as it is, with the interior transformation it demands for here and now, with the Last Judgment and the glory it announces for the end of time, and as well with the prevision of an undetermined span of time between the Ascension and the return of the Son of Man in glory and majesty.

Once the text of the New Testament is read without mutilations according to the good pleasure of gratuitous hypotheses transformed into systems, one cannot help but see the Church appear, fashioned and quickened by the loving care of the Saviour. Jesus first spent a long time in her preparation,

and then established her in all her essential elements, with the promise of His aid until the end of time.

The word "church," *ecclesia*, is found in the Gospel as a translation of the word used by Christ. Formerly it had been used in the Septuagint to signify the synagogue, but a synagogue in a halo of sanctity, an assembly of the saved, an assembly of the elect. Just as the Jewish people of the Old Testament formed the church of God, so the people whom Christ had gathered together, and which comprised all nations, was to be the Church of Christ: "I shall build my church." It was without doubt a church for this world, which should combat the enemy of the human race: "The gates of Hell will not prevail against it."

* * * *

Surely, it is enough to allow oneself to be taught by the writings of the New Testament and to see Jesus first preparing and then founding the society which was designed to continue Him when His presence would no longer be visible, and to see also the Apostles from the very first days acting as heads of the new institution.

First of all, the Master assembles about His person, by way of the nucleus for a church, disciples who have accompanied Him from the beginning of His public life. After a while He chooses twelve. He lives with them, teaches them, forms them, and reveals Himself to them as the Messias, and as the Son of the Living God. He has them make a trial of the apostolate, establishes them as His witnesses who should announce His doctrine, testify to His resurrection, and in their turn work the same miracles that He had done, and in such wise bring together the Jews, the Samaritans and all the peoples of the earth under the new law. Whoever hears them hears their Master, and whoever despises them despises Him. Whatever they bind among men will be bound in Heaven, and whatever they loose will be loosed in Heaven. They are evidently the heads of that church before which evildoers should be brought, who should accept their sentence under pain of being considered as pagans and publicans.

There is, however, one among the twelve whom Jesus sets apart during the time of His public life, at the hour of His passion, and after the resurrection, who later, in like manner, is to be set apart from the day of the Pentecost until the hour of his martyrdom. This is Peter. He has received all from the Master, even to his name. He had been called Simon. Jesus bestowed the name of Cephas upon him. We translate it as Peter, but it would perhaps better be translated by the word "rock." After being clarified by nineteen centuries of history, how is one to read the famous text of St. Matthew, chapter 16, without seeing there an announcement of what is realized in the Catholic Church? The scene is recounted just as it took place, with that simplicity which is the mark of the divine. While walking in the neighbourhood of Cesarea Philippi, Jesus stops abruptly and speaks to all his disciples, asking them: Whom do they say I am? This was a problem that was already in the mind of each of them. Who is this rabbi from Nazareth, who never studied and who confounds the doctors of the Law, who speaks as no man has ever spoken, who out of goodness, and as if trying to keep himself hidden, works the most astounding miracles! At the very least, most of them thought, he was one of the great prophets come back to earth—John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremias, or someone else of their stature. The

apostles report these different opinions, but Jesus now asks a more direct question: "But whom do *you* say that I am?" It was they who had received all the illumination and all the confidences that the Gospels narrate, and doubtless many others as well which are not found in them (the Gospels are very short, and a day between two nights of Jesus was very long, and often crowded with events.) The grace radiating from the Master's incomparable sanctity enlightened their souls. Hence, it is to be supposed that all, perhaps, surmised the mystery, and that they guarded it in their hearts, without having had the occasion to formulate it in words until that moment. This, at least, was the case of Peter. Either because he obeyed the urge of his impulsive temperament, or because he had already in some way taken on the character of head, it was he who replied: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God."

Thus, this simple man who had abandoned his boat and his nets for Jesus, knew and proclaimed that most consoling news, the Incarnation of the Son of God. "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona," Jesus said to him, "because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Herein lies the truth that makes Christians, that is stated in all the creeds, that was defended at Nicea, Ephesus, Chalcedon, and Constantinople, that ceaselessly resounds beneath the vaults of the churches, and that in our days has been presented by the Amsterdam Assembly as the basis for the Ecumenical Council. It hold that glory of the Son of Man that Jesus, in his discourse after the Last Supper, proclaims as the resumé of his teaching and as the bond of those who are to believe in Him. Such being the case, then just as this truth is the foundation of all Christian doctrine, so the one who first, by grace of the Father, confessed it with his whole heart, will be the foundation of the society that continues the work of Jesus. "And I say to thee: That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church. And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." What could be more clear? "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock." In the Latin version the likeness between Peter and the rock becomes more evident: "Tu es *Petrus* et super hanc *petram*." In Aramaic, the language in which Jesus spoke, the word is the same in both cases: "*Kefas*." Therefore, the rock that is to be the foundation of the Church is not a truth, not even that which Peter confessed: it is a person. It is not Christ Himself, because here he has the character of the builder. It is the blessed disciple, the rock. "Thou art Peter (Rock,) and upon this rock . . ." Doubtless, one should also say that Peter is the foundation of the Church for the reason that he maintains her truths, and especially the principal truth of Christ, Son of the Living God; and one should say that Peter himself rests upon Christ, the cornerstone upon which everything in His Church rests. But that which Jesus immediately, without shadow of doubt or ambiguity, signifies is that all the stones for His Church will rest upon the person of Peter as their support.

* * * *

At Cesarea Philippi, Jesus had spoken in the future tense: "I will build my church," "I will give to thee the keys . . ." Assuredly, this is enough to guarantee us that he actually did it. Nevertheless, the Gospels explain how the resurrected Lord commanded the apostles to continue His mission, and St. John in particular narrates how the position that had already been announced for Peter was conferred upon him. Once again, speaking to Simon, Son of

John, the one who had confessed that He was the Son of the Living God, Jesus induces him to make reparation for his triple denial by a triple declaration of love, and in return, He gives into his care all His sheep, both large and small, of which He Himself is the Good Shepherd, and for whom He had given His life. "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." (Jo. XXI, 15) This is a truly evangelical scene; all is done in Jesus' own way, in His way of accomplishing great things with the simplest words and the most familiar sort of actions.

If all rests upon Peter, and if Peter is the leader of the entire flock, what will happen when Peter is no more? Since the Church must endure, it must in some wise continue to rest upon Peter. Indeed, it is he that will be invoked; recourse will be had to his see. The powers and the privileges promised to him on the road to Cesarea Philippi are transmitted to his successors. It is not only in our times that the matter has been thus understood. In the fifth century St. Leo declares it in formal terms: in the person of Leo, Peter is to be considered, "he is to be honoured in whom perseveres the care of all pastors, with the custody of all the sheep confided to him, and whose dignity is not lacking even in an unworthy heir."[1] And for long ages the Roman Church has testified by her word and by her acts that such was her faith, and she has cited Jesus' words to Peter "which could not be clearer if He did mean what Rome says he meant."[2]

* * * *

Catholic authors have collected many texts from St. Clement of Rome to St. Augustine that express the belief of early times in the permanence of Peter's power in the Church, and more precisely in the supremacy of the Church of Rome. Yet, even if these texts were not so luminous nor so plentiful as they are, would it not be enough to consider on the one hand Christ's words to Simon, Son of John, and on the other what actually happened in history to conclude that the one explains the other, that history reveals the meaning of the divine promise and that the latter throws light upon history? Time was needed for the full realization of what Jesus announced, and perhaps new developments are still possible. Still, at no point has reality surpassed that which was written. Even today, the eminent position occupied by Peter's successor (in fact, only one man claims to be that) finds adequate expression in these same words: upon this rock I will build my church. Anyone reflecting well upon this fact will understand the position taken by the Anglican Robinson at the Conversations of Malines. He conceded that Providence had directed the evolution of papal power. But this was saying too little. Providence had directed history in such wise as to realize the word of Jesus. Christ had all of history beneath his gaze when he spoke to Peter: He announced to him what He willed to accomplish. If the development of the papacy is providential, it is, for this reason alone, difficult not to believe that it was willed by the Church's divine founder; and disbelief is altogether impossible in view of the fact that this founder had said precisely the words that express this development and that express it all the better as the development becomes more advanced. The event clarifies the prophecy. Seeing the heir of Peter ruling the Church gives me the conviction that this is quite what Christ willed when He said to Peter: "upon this rock I will build my church."

[1]) *Sermo 2, in anniversario.*
[2]) Fr. Maturin, *A memoir, with Selected Letters,* M. Ward, London, 1920, p. 152.

What follows, although it is of weighty import, is merely the development of these words. Jesus then continues: "I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Peter will open, and it will truly be opened; he will close and it will be truly closed, just as a proprietor opens and closes his house. Tradition has understood that this power of the keys is the power of remitting sins. For our present purposes it is sufficient that it signifies the authority invested in Peter to open (or to close) the door of spiritual goods. "Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." Here again the meaning is clear: in this church of which he is the foundation, and of which he holds the keys, Peter will receive the authority to legislate, pass judgment, to condemn, and to absolve. Does one not sense a formal delegation in the words of Christ: thou shalt bind or loose, thou shalt pronounce judgment, thou shalt decide, and whatever thou shalt have done, I shall hold as done?

Thus, at one time two aspects of the church are established. She is a spiritual society, a society of pardon, a society of grace, a society of love of God and of neighbour. Her proper goods are invisible. However, she is a society of men, with heads, and with a supreme head who will remain when Christ will have ascended to His Father. She is then a visible society. Jesus employs parables to describe the Kingdom of God that signify an external and temporal society in which good and evil men are mixed together. Also, Jesus made Himself visible so as to bring us invisible goods. He was the Incarnate Word, the Son Who had assumed human form to tell men what he saw in the bosom of the Father. The Church continues Him. "The Church," says Bossuet, "is Jesus Christ extended and communicated."[3]

She will last until the end of time, that is, until the return of the Lord, to the day and the hour of the Parousia. She must continue without becoming anything else than herself. At each moment she is the Church of Christ. She teaches the doctrine of Christ, distributes the goods of Christ, she is established as Christ has willed her to be, she has the key that Christ has given her. If it were otherwise, the work of Christ would have disappeared. But God's work does not disappear. Jesus is the master of history. His Church is indefectible. He Himself declared this, and most forcefully: the powers of hell will not prevail against His Church. Wherefore, although He is invisible, He will remain with His own: "Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."[4] With Him no one need fear: He has conquered the world. He will send to His own the Spirit Who will teach them. One has the same assurance with regard to eternal salvation: "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned."[5] This teaching bears with it grave consequences: it is befitting that Jesus should preserve it absolutely correct.

* * * *

Have we considered well all that this preservation of truth implies? It would be useless to make a distinction between indefectibility and infallibility. A society created for the purpose of transmitting divine revelation to us ceases to be indefectible the moment it errs or leads us into error. It is not

[3]) *Lettre sur le Mystere de l'Eglise.*
[4]) Matt. XXVIII, 20.
[5]) Mk. XVI, 15, 16.

enough that truth be found in it at certain moments or among some part of its members. It should possess it always and should profess it through its authorized organs. It is necessary that one be able to know where the truth of Christ is to be found. Otherwise, Christ is not continued, the Church is no more, and there is no more Christianity. One could perhaps go even further with a writer who repeated what had given St. Augustine cause for so much reflection at the time he was on the way to conversion: "It could not be, I thought, that God had provided no place in which the spirit of man might rest. Somewhere there must be certainty."[6] In any case, if Jesus Christ founded a Church, he made it infallible. She is mistress of truth, and when hearing her, one hears the Word, Truth. "He that heareth you, heareth me."[7]

But infallibility requires an organ. The body of the faithful doubtless receive the gift of a Christian sense inclining them in certain cases toward a determined affirmation, and disinclining them to a contrary affirmation. Nevertheless, this is ordinarily a matter of a confused sentiment which can easily receive troubled elements, and which consequently needs to be controlled, and which in any case is incapable of solving all the problems that may arise. Is this infallible organ made up of those who have been placed in the direction of the Church? If they are taken separately, then what a miracle of Providence would be required for them to agree spontaneously on all the essential points of doctrine! As a matter of fact, we see throughout the course of history heads of particular churches teaching errors, at times insisting upon them tenaciously and becoming heresiarchs. They must then meet together, and abide by the decisions made by the assemblies that we call councils. If, in fact, the whole body of those who have authority to teach should profess error, the Church would fail in her mission, and would really no longer exist. But how many difficulties remain if the councils represent the supreme organ of infallibility! When would the council be sufficiently general? Who would be the judge of its liberty, of its normal functioning, of the majority obtained in each of its decisions, and of the meaning of its definitions? And if a council that is called general should stand in opposition to another of like pretentions, who is to judge between the two? It is of absolute necessity that the assemblies have a head, that he be one sole person, and that he be able to decide in last resort. Then, when one thinks of the concrete difficulties of assembling a universal council, and at the same time of the urgency that might arise for the suppression of an incipient heresy, or of impeding a threatening schism, one can only conclude that the one who has the authority of directing and approving the councils ought also have that of making decisions, independently of the councils, when the faith of the Church is at stake. The personal infallibility of the Church's head is a corollary of the Church's indefectibility. If, then, the Church requires an infallible head, who will it be if not the successor of him to whom Jesus said: whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven? Here again, the accord between what the needs of the Church call for and the words Jesus pronounces confirm our conviction that we make no mistake in giving the Gospel text its full sense, which perhaps we would not have dared to give it with such firm assurance

[6]) Stanley B. James, *The Adventures of a Spiritual Tramp*, London, New York, 1925, p. 155.
[7]) Lk. X, 16 .

if the facts of history along with the needs of the Church had not cast their light upon it.

* * * *

The Church is established as a visible society through its government. Hence, it is quite natural that she possess visible rites according to which she affiliates her members and succors them in all their needs. In fact, we find in the text of the New Testament, and in the institutions of the very first age of the Church that which in succeeding times acquired the name of sacrament. The apostles receive the mission of baptizing all nations in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, so that men will be reborn by virtue of water and the Holy Spirit. They are to renew the mystery that their Master enacted at the end of the Last Supper. They are to remit or withhold pardon of sins, and this manifestly supposes the existence of an appropriate tribunal. There is, therefore, a union between the visible act and the spiritual effect. It would hardly be reasonable to fear in this any similarity to magic practices. In magic there is lack of proportion between the stated cause and the intended effect. I pierce the heart of my enemy in his image, and I believe I have killed him: the power that I suppose in my act is altogether imaginary. On the contrary, in baptism we have the mercy and power of God in action: the required ablution merely renders sensible, as it symbolizes, this divine action.

But, it has been objected, does it not mean placing a restriction on the liberty of the Holy Ghost, when through the use of certain gestures and certain formulas, one pretends to constrain His intervention, or contrariwise, would it not limit His action if the proper rites were to be omitted? Such a difficulty as this can arise only from an entirely external view of the matter. It was in all freedom that the Holy Spirit, in union with the Father and the Son, moved the heart of Christ to institute Baptism and the other sacraments; it is in all freedom that He today moves the hearts of men to call upon divine grace through the usage of these same sacraments; and it is also through the freest possible movements that He inspires the minister to effect his action with a will to do that which the Church wills. Here all is liberty and spirit. Moreover, nothing limits the radiation of grace: He who gives it and Who ordinarily wills to give it through the sacraments, can, as often it must be done, also give it without the sacraments. It is not rather by a rejection, even to the point of rejecting the possibility of sacramental institution, that divine liberty is arbitrarily limited?

Properly understood, the use of the sacraments does not deprive one of immediate contact with the divine influence, but far more serves to procure it. It testifies to the condescendence of our heavenly Father who acts in conformity with our nature. "If you had no body," says St. John Chrysostom, "God would have made simple and incorporal gifts for you, but since your soul is united to a body, He offers you intelligible things in those that are sensible." (*Homily* 60 *to the People of Antioch.*)

* * * *

We have considered a visible, hierarchical, and sacramental Church; but have we exhausted her constitutional characteristics? There must be added, and this is of utmost importance, that the Church is living. Just as living begins, she has within herself a possibility, and the exigency of movement. Far from being astonished at seeing her develop her doctrine and institu-

tions through the course of the centuries, we should recognize in this sign the wisdom and the omnipotence of her Founder Who did not all at one time form an inert society that would soon have appeared strange and unadapted to the changing conditions of humanity, but a living entity whose virtualities would unfold according to a certain order, and which would turn to its own good the action to be exercised upon it by all the regions of the universe.

Anyone denying the power of legitimate development in the Church could not logically remain in any of the present day societies which profess to be Christian. None of them, in fact, reproduces without addition or subtraction the historical state of the Church in the first century. One is obliged at the outset to admit a certain evolution. Newman in his *via media* followed the progress of the Church up to the fourth and fifth centuries, and expected to remain there. The heirs of Photius arrive at the seventh Council in the eighth century, and halt there. But would it not seem quite as probable that if the Church could have been the subject of developments willed by God up to the fourth, or to the eighth century, that she could in like manner have undergone developments in following centuries?

One cannot *a priori* be astonished at seeing the Catholic Church extending her primitive traits and arriving at others of more recent date. She is not other than herself for this reason any more than a man would be another because he is no longer a child. The Church has always been adult, and will always be young. Her movement takes place within her maturity. Yet the movement is real, and at times of wonderful magnitude and scope. An instance is the fervent cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary that so many Protestants feel they should reprove. It is very true that it has become inseparable from Catholic piety. Perhaps there is no church that does not have its altar dedicated to the Virgin. A great number of cathedrals and important sanctuaries are dedicated to her. There are religious congregations and Orders that bear her name. The *Ave Maria,* the rosary, the Angelus, and the *Salve Regina* are recited by everyone who has not ceased praying. Doctrine itself has been enriched. At a certain moment of history, an opinion was formulated and it gained, little by little, a hearing among Christians; it appeared with increasing clarity, and finally became the belief of all. It was recognized that it was implied in revelation, and the supreme authority imposed it upon the belief of the faithful. In such wise, for example, we have had the dogmas of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption of Mary.

There has been, then, a growth, but nothing simply new. All that Catholics believe with regard to the Virgin Mary is found, at least in germ, and in an implicit state, in what the New Testament tells us. She is Mother of Jesus, of the Incarnate Word, the Redeemer of mankind. She possesses, therefore, all that such dignity, all that such a union with the Saviour requires. Little by little, the Christian conscience assisted by the Spirit of God became aware of the riches contained in the mystery of Mary. Yet, it would be a grave error for anyone to think that the exaltation of the Mother is detrimental to devotion to the Son. Quite the contrary: it is because a Christian has an incomparable idea of the Incarnate Word that he spontaneously honours the Mother, and believes himself incapable of honouring her too much. It is because of honour to the Lord, *"propter honorem Domini,"* that St. Augustine made an exception of the Virgin when he main-

tained our incapacity of avoiding all sin, even venial, against Pelagius. Experience furnishes sufficient proof that wherever the cult of Mary flourishes, there also the love and homage rendered to Christ are the most fervent, as for example, at Lourdes. When then, is the Lord Jesus more adored and better served than in the Catholic Church? Where then are there more souls entirely consecrated to Him, or more generous sacrifices offered to Him?

It is by the same passage of implicit to explicit from seed to plant, that the other growths occurring in the Church are justified. What could be more normal? If revelation has been given, as it has, by means of words that were heard, and by inspired writings, it is quite natural that there should be progress. When a proposition is presented to the human intelligence, a spontaneous work of reflection takes place whose purpose is to analyze the content so as to understand it better; a comparison is made with other propositions of the same order or of a different order. From this work there results necessarily inferences and conclusions that constitute a progress of the received doctrine and an enrichening of the spirit. The assistance that Christ promised to His Church guarantees the legitimacy and the truth of these new affirmations.

* * * *

Of course, if one desires to understand the Church, he must look upon her with the eyes of faith. Whoever considers her as an ordinary society, with the weaknesses, the blunders, sometimes even with the faults of those who command, and as well with the transgressions of those who ought to obey, sees nothing, so to speak, but the shadow, or the reverse side of the Church. One should rather turn his eyes to the head which is Christ, and to the soul which is the Holy Ghost. Indeed, St. Paul tells us that the Church is the Body of Christ; she prolongs it as the body prolongs the head. He vivifies her and moves her as the head vivifies and moves the body. Christ and the Church—this is the complete body. It is the Church as Christ founded her, with her visibility, with her hierarchy, and with her sensible sacraments. One sould not imagine that there are two Churches, one exterior and juridical, and the other purely spiritual and invisible. She is at once both of these. She would be unable to be the bearer of interior graces among men, if she did not do so in a visible organism. She is then all-holy, being formed entirely by Christ. The sinful members who might be found in her do not belong to her because of their sinfulness, but because they retain something that is of her, that is, faith and the possibility of regaining the warmth of charity. Thus, ever pure and immaculate, she is the worthy spouse of Christ, conquered by His Blood. Christ loves her and never abandons her. The marriage of Christians is the symbol of this jealous love of Christ for His Church, and this is why marriage is a sacrament, and cannot permit of divorce. The assistance promised by Jesus is not to be looked upon as a distant and general sort of supervision, but as the loving help of a spouse, always at hand, always thoughtfully considerate and attentive.

Jesus vivifies the Church with His Spirit. Being the Son, to Whom belongs all that is of the Father, He with the Father sends the Holy Ghost to His Church. As man, His own soul is filled with the Spirit, and He communicates it to His members, as befits the perfect head of a living body. The Holy Ghost is the soul of the Church. Indeed, eternal life, of which we

receive on earth the pledge and the first-fruits, is nothing else than charity, the participation in that love which constitutes the life of the Divinity. The love of God can be given only by the Divinity. Even the humanity of Christ can serve merely as the channel or the instrument for such a gift. Likewise, all the hierarchy of the Church, and the sacraments, and the Virgin, and Christ Himself as man, are only, each in its own way, instruments which facilitate the immediate union of the Divinity with the souls in the Church. In fact, since the three Persons of the Holy Trinity are inseparable, they come together in this communication of themselves, although Scripture and Tradition invite us to attribute it to the Holy Ghost, to "appropriate" it to Him, as the theologians say, for the reason that He proceeds from the love of the Father and the Son.

* * * *

Here, I feel I must express a measure of surprise. The Church, as she is known within Catholicism, is entirely orientated upon the participation of invisible and divine goods; in manifold ways she aspires to the very life of God; she receives within herself this life through the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in souls; she lives, indeed, by virtue of the Holy Ghost, as a body lives by virtue of its soul. Yet it is this Church, resplendent with supernatural life, that our separated brethren too frequently speak of as wholly exterior and juridical, a body without a soul! Why do they not take into account that the essence of Catholicism consists precisely in the recognition of this real and interior participation in divine goods, in this new life, this creation, not merely announced, but given on this earth to those who have put on Christ? The justice of God and of His Christ is not merely imputed to us without being in any way communicated to us, but it makes us just, that is, makes us to love Him above all things, not, to be sure, with our own strength, which is nothing but the weakness of sons of the first Adam, but with the strength that the Second Adam communicates to us.

The Church is Christ's spouse, living by His Spirit; she is the Mother of Christians. The Apocalypse shows her, along with the Virgin Mary, giving birth and saving the fruit of her womb from the wrath of the dragon. Indeed, the supernatural life of the faithful comes to them through the Church because Christ established her for the receiving and communicating of the gifts of His Spirit. Between this Mother and these children there is an exchange of the same sentiments as those that flourish in the midst of a family. The Church is patient with her children, devoted to them, and attentive to all their needs. They, in return, love the Church. To cite but one instance, and this of a layman, Charles de Montalambert stirred the entire French Chamber when, in defense of the Church, he cried with great feeling: "Sirs, the Church is a mother!" In St. Peter's at Rome, when the crowds enthusiastically acclaim the Pope blessing them, it is not a commanding ruler, or a king that they honour, but the Vicar of Christ, the Church at her summit, so to speak; it is a Father whom they love.

* * * *

So far we have spoken of the Church without mentioning the notes that hold such an outstanding place in the treatises on the Church: unity, catholicity, sanctity, apostolicity. This is because our intention has been to describe the Church of Christ as she is in herself, rather than to distinguish that which is not her. Moreover, we must acknowledge that today, at least

many of our separated brethren recognize that the Church should be one, and that they do not themselves possess this unity. Nevertheless, they believe that they belong to the Church, which is not, in their minds, the Catholic Church. They would have her the totality of Christians who have lost unity, who seek for it, but who will not find it, doubtless, before the end of time, or in Heaven. It seems to us that they can speak in such wise because they cannot bring themselves to give full attention to the indefectibility of the Church that we have seen guaranteed in Holy Scripture by the very words of the Lord. It is the wisdom and the power of Christ that are brought into question. He founded one sole Church, He willed that this Church be truly one to announce the same truth, and he made a solemn request of His Father that this unity be granted.

Could it be that He was not heard? Is it possible that what He willed and established, and to which He promised His aid for all time was unable to withstand the wear of time or the malice of men? Did He not know how to found a work that would endure? Or did He, to Whom all power had been given in Heaven and on earth, lack the power to maintain it? And if, in very fact, there exists today upon the earth a Church which is truly one, of which the members confess the same faith because they recognize the same supreme authority, does it not become manifest that this authority was established by the wisdom of Christ and maintained throughout the vicissitudes of history by His divine power?

Catholicity is bound to unity. In the abstract, one may call the universal Church the totality of the denominations who bear a Christian name: but it is clear enough that this is a logical fiction contradicted by reality. By the same token, one could speak of a universal army by lumping together all the soldiers of the world. The universal Church must be one sole.

One may say the same of apostolicity, which supposes unity across time. Wherever a rupture has occurred in the transmission of powers, wherever doctrine has been, we will not say developed and explained, but altered or suppressed, the bond with the Church of the Apostles has been broken. Another religious society has come into being.

The Church of Christ can only be holy, since the head is Christ and the soul the Holy Ghost. One has the assurance beforehand that the divine influence will quicken her members and that Christian virtues will shine in them. Let it suffice here to say that on the one hand the Church which claims to be the sole Church of Christ ought to show this sanctity to a greater degree than the other Christian societies, and that on the other hand, all religious denominations that advance in the practice of the virtues tend insomuch to enter into the unity willed by Christ.

* * * *

In bringing our reflections to an end, we feel we should express a conclusion that we would like to have considered by everyone interested in ecumenical problems. The Church of Jesus Christ could not have disappeared. She is upon the earth today. Jesus willed this Church to be hierarchical and one. She is not made up, therefore, of the multitude of socities that call themselves Christian, but remain independent one of another, sometimes hostile, and which differ on essential points of faith. Only one of these societies is the Church of Christ. If she did not exist, the Incarnate Word would have failed in His work, and it would be useless to think of Christian

unity. Of course, it would still be possible to attempt the realization of an understanding among all Christians based on a minimum acceptable to all. But, the grouping obtained in this wise would be a human work; no authority would be capable of declaring its legitimacy. In any case, it could not be the Church founded by Christ, one, hierarchical, and indefectible. The only hope of Christian unity consists, therefore, in the present existence of a Christian society that possesses unity of faith, of government, of worship, and in the possibility of other Christian societies arriving at this same faith, under the same government, and with the same worship. Those are certainly mistaken who think they find an obstacle to Christian unity in this faith confessed by the Catholic Church that she is the only Church of Jesus Christ. Far from being an obstacle, it is the indispensable condition for the final realization of Christian unity.

CHARLES BOYER, S.J.

The Church in Anglican Theology

Article XIX defines the Church thus: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same. As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch, have erred, so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." This is the only definition of the Church in the Articles, and it is noteworthy that, even though it was probably inspired by the Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, it speaks only of the *visible* Church and adds no phrase like the Lutheran: *Et ad veram unitatem Ecclesiae satis est consentire de doctrina evangelii et administratione sacramentorum*, redolent of an *invisible* Church. The reason for this is probably to be found in the history of that time. The Reformation in England had begun, not from a revolt of English churchmen against the doctrines taught by Rome, but from the repudiation by Henry VIII of papal jurisdiction. That left the rest, for the time being at least, intact—church organization with its provinces, dioceses, parishes etc.; the bishops were the same as before; the religious services remained unaltered. The doctrinal changes introduced by Cranmer and confirmed by Elizabeth still left a complete external organization, as part of the Church by law established. Englishmen were used to, and still saw, a visible Church: it was only the extremer Puritan elements who wished to do away with external ceremonies and hierarchical organization and who believed only in an invisible Church.

Clearly the formulators of Article XIX considered that their own Church came within the terms of the definition. In Art. VI they had already declared: "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." The claim of the English reformers, as it was of the Continental ones too, was that they had returned to the scriptures as the basis of faith and abolished Roman "abuses" and accretions that had no foundation therein. They admitted of only two dominical sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord: the rest "have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God" (Art. XXV.) So Art. XIX, when it speaks of "the Sacraments," means only Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This definition, then, general to all the Reformed Churches, was adopted by the English Reformers to describe their own Reformed Church; and, if it was not intentionally phrased so as to deny that the Church of Rome was any longer a true Church, at least it was meant to rebut any claim Rome might make to be the sole true Church and, as the second paragraph, clearly states, to be infallible.

Before the Reformation there was no worked-out theology of the Church, so that the Church of England could not inherit it with what other parts of Catholic doctrine it retained. Nor did it ever evolve one for itself, but was content to meet attacks with answers suited to the grounds alleged against it. It was assailed from two sides, the Catholic and the Puritan. To the Catholics it replied that it was the same Church as had

ever existed in England, though now purified from Roman abuses: it claimed to have sacrificed no point of primitive faith, to possess bishops who were the successors of the pre-Reformation holders of the sees—in a word, to be the Church of Christ in England. The Puritans for the most part inveighed against the Established Church as still too "Romish," and in particular they wanted the office of bishop altogether abolished. The other section of the Church (for the Puritans at that time were still "Anglicans,") though concessions could be made as regards vestments, ornaments and the position of Communion table, had perforce to defend episcopacy, if for no other reason, at least for this, that it was part of the "establishment." They varied somewhat in the claim they made for it. Some accounted it of divine institution; others of apostolic or even post-apostolic origin. As the controversy waxed and as, with the growth of the doctrine of the "divine right of kings," king and bishops became more and more interdependent, this question easily took the first place and was settled only by the Civil War. The Puritans prevailed at first, but at the Restoration the bishops came into their own again.

The restoration of the monarchy (1660) was naturally followed by the restoration of the Prayer Book and an act of Uniformity, and for the first time the Puritans were forced out of the Anglican Church and subjected to disabilities similar to those imposed on Catholics. With the return of the king there came, too, a return of the doctrine of the "divine right of kings," so that, when the Catholic James II was constrained to abdicate in 1688 in favour of his Protestant daughter Mary and her Calvinist husband William, the Archbishop of Canterbury with five other bishops and some 400 of the lower clergy who could not in conscience repudiate the oath they had taken to James, the "Lord's anointed," went into schism and the sees of the bishops were filled by others. Politics became inextricably mixed up with religion, for the Nonjurors still looked on the exiled James as their rightful sovereign; but in the literature that followed from both sides jurors and nonjurors defended their action on religious grounds.[1] The Nonjurors began by denying the legitimacy of the appointment of bishops to sees whose holders were still living, and went on to inveigh against State interference in ecclesiastical affairs and to demand spiritual autonomy for the Church—for this they received the benediction of the Oxford Movement more than a century later. The other party upheld the right of the State over the temporalities of the Church, and one of them, Bishop Hoadly of Bangor, pressed the defence so far as to make Christ the Head of the Church in such a way as to deny every other authority —the Church, that is, is solely invisible. But Hoadly's conclusions were peculiar to himself and were rejected by the others of his own party. The argument in favour of the *status quo* between Church and State that satisfied the XVIIIth-century Latitudinarian mind was to show that such an arrangement was "in the nature of things." Just as a "social contract" underlay the relations between governors and governed in the civil society, so a "contract" based upon mutual utility imposed "establishment" for the numerically-largest Church in the State, the Church surrendering its independence in return for protection (Warburton, 1736.) Paley (1785,) though denying any "contract," reached the same general conclusions from

[1]) Cf. N. Sykes: *Church and State in England in the XVIIIth Century;* Cambridge (1934,) Chap. VII.

"considerations of public utility," though these led him to some strange results, as, e.g., his justification of the three-fold order of the ministry, "in order to supply each class of the people with a clergy of their own level and description."

Meanwhile on the Continent there had been established a number of Reformed Churches to which the Anglican Church was indebted, not only for much of its spirit and doctrine, but also hospitality when some of its members were in exile; and all shared a common opposition to the Church of Rome. Yet many of these continental Churches, either in their first excess of zeal or for lack of consecrators, had lost the office of bishop and possessed a ministry not episcopally ordained. What attitude should be adopted towards them? Should they be considered Churches or not? The general feeling of the Anglican Church is well shown by the words of Wake (Archbishop of Canterbury 1716-36:) "I bless God that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal Church; which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the Apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm that where the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the sacraments."[2]

That attitude sufficed for Anglicanism till well into the XIXth century, when the general trend towards religious toleration and indifference, and, very much more, the growing Oxford Movement brought the whole question to the fore. The primary purpose of men like Newman, in revolt against the conception of the Church as a mere department of State, was to recall Anglicans to an appreciation of the nature and character of their Church. The very first Tract, from Newman's pen, was a clarion-call—the bishops are the successors of the Apostles, and the authority of the Church is built on "our apostolic descent," by which was meant the unbroken line of episcopal succession. His most famous Tract 90 was an attempt to prove that all of the XXXIX Articles are patient of a Catholic explanation. Apostolicity and catholicity were for Newman essential qualities of the Church of Christ, and he claimed both, but especially the former, for Anglicanism. Out of this came forth the Branch Theory: "The one visible Catholic Church on earth, the true continuation and representatives of that founded at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, is at this time divided by differences about secondary matters into three local parts, all agreeing in the necessary faith, viz. the Orthodox Eastern Churches and the Western, the latter being subdivided into the Continental and the British. In their respective dioceses each holds original and legitimate jurisdiction."[3] But, however much the bishops may have approved of the defence of their apostolic succession, they were very unwilling to accept the consequences of the authority Newman and his associates thrust upon them. Their coldness was one factor that forced Newman out of Anglicanism, and their opposition to the "catholicising" tenets and practices of the Ritualists led these to appeal for authority for the actions, not to the Anglican episcopate, but to the practice of the other two Branches. For Newman, however, and the Oxford Movement, episcopacy in apostolic succession, strictly understood, was an essential of the Church: the episode of the Jerusalem bishopric would seem to imply that it was not so considered by the Anglican episcopate which (with some few exceptions,) with the greater part of the

[2]) Quoted by N. Stykes: *The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the XVI and XVII Centuries;* London, 1948, p. 22.

[3]) W. Palmer: *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church,* 1840-1; London (1882) p. 354.

Anglican fold, was content with the old ideas and had no desire for further definition.

As the nineteenth century wore on, there came developments. Anglican missions abroad received bishops and, gradually becoming independent Churches, elected their own without reference to the British government. In 1850 the Catholic hierarchy was restored—an "Italian Mission" as opposed to the rightful hierarchy of the "Catholic Church in England." Relations with other Churches, almost exclusively Orthodox, were fostered and even sought. In 1896 the Bull *Apostolicae Curae* condemned Anglican Orders and provoked the reply published under the names of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York (but never submitted to either Convocation for approval) to vindicate the validity of their ordinations. Meanwhile an intense controversy within the Anglican Church had flared up and continued for many years, dealing ostensibly with the outward practices of ritualism, but in reality with the ideas they stood for, chief among which was: What really is a priest ordained to do? and so: What is the real meaning of bishop? Lay judges composed the courts that settled ecclesiastical cases and decided on the theological meaning of Church formularies, though a step towards juridical independence was taken when Archbishop Benson presided at the trial for illegal ritualistic practices of his suffragan, Bishop King of Lincoln.

Such was the general state of opinion in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth. The end of the first World War ushered in a new era within the ecclesiastical world of more general and more intimate relations between the Churches, that was promoted and canalised in part by the ecumenical movements. Anglicanism was ripe for it as is shown by the spirit of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 which, with the unanimous consent of the participants, produced the "Appeal to All Christian People," calling all to unity and professing Anglican readiness to cooperate with any sincere endeavour. That appeal contains a definition of the Church: "We acknowledge all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ, and having been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ, which is His Body. We believe that it is God's purpose to manifest this fellowship, so far as this world is concerned, in an outward, visible, and united society, holding one faith, having its own recognised officers, using God-given means of grace, and inspiring all its members to the world-wide service of the Kingdom of God. That is what we mean by the Catholic Church." The "Lambeth Quadrilateral"[4] is proposed as the basis of union, with the episcopate as the core of the ministry. Of the Orders of the non-episcopal bodies the same Appeal says: "It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communions which do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace."

In the years that followed, negotiations were carried on simultaneously both with the Free Churches of England[5] and with the Orthodox Churches, all parties of the Anglican Church being concerned in both series of relations, though the Evangelicals were naturally more interested in reaching agreement

[4]) 1. The Holy Scripture as the rule and standard of faith: 2. The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith: 3. The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion: 4. A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church: for which the episcopate is best fitted.

[5]) The term "Free Churches" includes Methodists, Wesleyans, Congregationalists, Baptists, etc.

with the Free Churches and the High Church party more fitted to deal with the Orthodox. In both cases questions of faith caused no insuperable difficulty: episcopacy was the topic most at issue. It was conceded to the Free Churches that under certain conditions: "Such Free ministries we find it impossible to regard as 'invalid,' that is, as null and void, or as effecting none of the purposes for which the ministry has been Divinely ordained in the Church of Christ:" indeed "we regard them as being within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church;" that is, "real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church:" while "The acceptance of Episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character." Even so, these conversations with the Free Churches produced no immediate, tangible results. Overtures to the Orthodox were more fruitful. Within the two decades following the issue of the "Appeal," five, or perhaps six, of the Orthodox Churches had expressed their readiness to recognise "by economy" the validity of Anglican ordinations. The most successful negotiations, however, were those with the Old Catholics. A conference at Bonn in 1931 agreed to intercommunion, with the provise that: "Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the acceptance of all dogmatic opinion, sacramental devotion, or liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the essentials of the Catholic faith."

Over all this period, from 1920-1939, there was a great increase in relations between all the Churches that took any part in the great international movements of *Faith and Order,* and of *Life and Work.* As the vast majority of such Churches were Protestant, naturally the Evangelical element of the Church of England felt more at home there, while the High Church party and the Orthodox were thrown rather on the defensive. As the ultimate aim of these Movements, as it is of the World Council of Churches that succeeded to them, is unity of action and unity of faith, the tendency is towards a minimising of the characteristics that differentiate the various Communions, while at the same time the impulse for local agreements is for ever being strengthened.

This outline of Anglican relations with other Churches subsequent to the Lambeth Conference of 1920 has been given so as to indicate briefly how the definition of "Church" in its "Appeal" was being worked out in practices. The negotiations with such diverse Churches has made the negotiators clarify their own ideas and express more exactly what they understand by "Church," with the result that the two main trends of Anglican thought, which of course existed before, are now more clearly delineated. The one trend is that of, roughly speaking, the Evangelicals with the Central party, whose interest lies in union with the Free Churches: the other, the High Church party, whose affinities are more with Catholicism and Orthodoxy. Both of these parties, while not rejecting the definition of Art. XIX, think now of the Church rather in terms of the Mystical Body of Christ, on the lines indicated in the description of the "Appeal," acknowledging "all those who believe in Our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptised into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the Universal Church of Christ, which is His Body." Both parties, too, accept the Lambeth Quadrilateral as a basis of agreement between Churches, but whereas the apostles of Home Reunion look on it as the maximum to be required, the others (taking it into consideration at all, I suspect, only because they have been saddled with it officially by

Lambeth) regard it rather as a minimum and only as a basis on which to construct. The former would limit the necessary requirements to a minimum—the less defined, the less there is to differ about—so as to embrace the largest possible number; the latter would demand acceptance of the whole Catholic faith as they understand it, even though this necessitate a consequent restriction of the field of reunion.

The late Bishop Headlam will serve as an example of the liberal approach to reunion. For some thirty years he was the centre of all Anglican unionistic activities and his book, *The Doctrine of the Church of England and Christian Reunion* (London, 1920) has been, I imagine, the most influential single factor in all recent schemes of reunion. The following synopsis does, I think, no injustice to the bishop's position. The basis of belief for all Christians is the Incarnation and the Trinity (p. 238:) the basis of faith is the Holy Scripture and the Nicene Creed—no other, for Christology was sufficiently defined by the time of Chalcedon, A.D. 451 (239-40.) No one may add to the Creed: even "to impose any particular interpretation on the Creed . . . is the same as to put forth a new and additional Creed" (p. 238.) Confirmation should not be insisted on as condition of reunion (p. 293.) "We shall never end our many troubles concerning the Eucharist until we have been willing to dispense entirely with definitions" (p. 279:) "We should have no necessary rules of faith about the Eucharist any more than the Church for the first 1,200 years of its history. Many of the evils of disunion have come from an attempt to define what cannot be defined" (p. 281.) About Orders, Christ "gave no directions as to the form or organization of the new community" (i.e. the Church), yet, "while it was clearly intended that the Church should possess a properly organized ministry, it was not intended that any particular form should be essential" (p 242.) Episcopacy, however, has "the clear authority of the Church" (p. 244.) Apostolic succession, as usually understood, is without foundation; and the Nonconformists "as regards the Sacraments have valid Sacraments, because they obey Christ's commands and intend to do what Christ bade them. They receive the Holy Spirit in their ordinations because they obey the Apostolic rite of laying on of hands with prayer, and are a part of Christ's Church;" so, "it is not possible to make any such distinction as is made between our Orders and theirs on the ground that they are without the Apostolic succession" (p. 265.) "It is, then, not because I believe that the historical episcopacy is necessary for valid Orders, but because I believe that it is necessary to secure Christian unity, that I hold that it must be the rule of a re-united Church" (p. 269.) So, "the Christian Church consists of all those who believe in the Lord Jesus and are baptised . . . The one condition of salvation is belief in Christ . . . There is no further limitation than this. The Church consists of all baptised Christians" (p. 219.) But the Church thus conceived is in fact divided into different religious bodies: "So . . . we cannot say that the society to which we belong is a branch of the Church and the others are not. The Church is the whole body of believers and should be one society. It is not so. The Church therefore, is rent asunder by schism, and each of these divisions is not a church, but a schism . . . We ought to speak of the Anglican schism, the Roman schism, the Wesleyan schism and so on . . . We are separate divisions or schism of the Body of Christ. Some may represent the ideal of a Christian Church less imperfectly than others, but as we are disunited we are all imperfect . . ."[6]

[6]) A.C. Headlam: *Christian Unity;* London 1930 p. 85. The same ideas are to be found also in his *Doctrine of the C. of E. and Reunion,* but less concisely.

This idea of the generally schismatic character of all Churches has caught on within Anglicanism and is to be found e.g. in the Report: *Doctrine in the Church of England,* (London, 1938,) p. 112: "That Body (i.e. the Christian Body) is not to be thought of as consisting of a single true Church, or group of Churches, with a number of 'schismatic' bodies gathered about it, but as a whole which is in a state of division or 'schism' . . . it becomes true to affirm that if any are in schism, all are in schism." It has had its repercussions, too, in other sections of theology, notably in the theology of the validity of Orders. The line of argument is briefly this: Orders have two elements, a "power" given by God, and an "authority" bestowed by the Church, i.e., the Universal Church: but no Church is *the* Church, but only a schism of it: so that in respect at least of "authority" the Orders of all Churches without exception are defective.[7]

The High Church element, too, bases its ideas of the Church on the doctrine of the Mystical Body: "Becoming a Christian and becoming a member of the Church are synonymous; faith and baptism are conjoined . . . If our adoption into Christ's sonship is ontological and not merely legal, so is our brotherhood with one another. If we are each of us members of Christ, then we are collectively. His Body."[8] But the writers of their school would have the faith, an integral faith. One of their objections to the South India Church Scheme was the danger to the integrity of the faith lurking in phrases like: "The uniting Churches . . . do not intend . . . to exclude reasonable liberty of interpretation" (i.e. of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds); and the refusal on the part of a "substantial minority" of the bishops of the 1948 Lambeth Conference to acknowledge the Orders of the new Church as true Orders "in the Church of Christ" was based upon doubts about the faith of that Church. The Church is essentially the Body of Christ, but His Body in the world: so it must have an exterior organization which owes its origin to Him. The essence of that lies in the sacraments. Baptism and Confirmation—the latter too is essential—provide the initiation into the Church: the Eucharist is at once the sacrament and sacrifice of Christ, the Head of the Church, and continues its life. Orders, especially the episcopate, provide the centre of visible unity: "The episcopate is the divinely ordained ministerial instrument for securing to the Church of God its continuous and organic unity.[9] The Church's faith is embodied in the Scriptures and the Creeds, safeguarded by the episcopate, the organ for teaching: "The bishop was the responsible guardian of the apostolic doctrine."[10] The episcopate is essential to the Church, being of its *esse*: and apostolic succession, i.e., an unbroken line back to the apostles, is necessary for the validity of episcopal consecration, for a bishop belongs to the "essential ministry" only in so far as he has his powers from the apostles, who had them from Christ. Each diocese is a "local Church;" is, as it were, the Church in miniature with its bishop at the head as symbol of unity with certain inalienable functions, now practically reduced to the handing on of sacerdotal powers by priestly ordination and episcopal consecration. But "the Bishop is by no means a mere delegate of the people. He stands in their midst (i.e. at the celebration of the Eucharist) as the repre-

[7]) Cf. O.C. Quick: *The Christian Sacraments;* (London, 1948) p. 141 seq.; *Lambeth Conf.* 1948 (London, 1948) Appendix, p. 64.
A.E.J. Rawlinson: *Problems of Reunion;* (London, 1950) p. 65 seq.
[8]) E.L. Mascall: *Christ, the Christian, and the Church;* (London, 1946) pp. 109-10. As the title shows, this whole book is about the Mystical Body of Christ as the Church.
[9]) K.E. Kirk: *The Apostolic Ministry;* (London, 1946) p. 8.
[10]) *Ibid.* p. 13.

sentative of Christ: to the Mystical Body he is the visible embodiment of its invisible Head."[11]

The larger unity of the Church is manifested by the rule of episcopal consecration by three bishops. There is no need of any central focus of unity like the Papacy, because in the Church of Rome "there is no clear distinction in practice between what is due to human authority and what is owed to God . . . the Roman bishop can never rightly be called Christ's vicar, as if he were taking the place of Christ and of the Holy Ghost. Absolute authority is never committed to men; it belongs to God and the human servant of the Lord is sent in His Master's Name, not as His 'vicar' but as His 'representative' "[12] E.L. Mascall rejects the Papacy for another reason: "The Church is a visible and tangible society, but it is a sacramental one, and the organ of its unity will be a sacramental organ. This is why, as I see it, the apostolic Episcopate precisely fulfills the requirements for such an organ, for the episcopal character is conferred by a sacramental act. And this is why it seems to me impossible to locate the organ of the Church's unity in the Papacy, for the papal character is not conferred by a sacramental act at all, but by the purely administrative and organizational process of election."[13]

Whether the adherents of this school would "unchurch" non-episcopal communions, they do not say; but, seeing that for them episcopacy is essential for the Church, it is to be presumed that they would. This, however, does not mean that they are not zealous for the union of Christendom, but only that they are not prepared to accept it at the cost of their principles.

* * * *

These two views of the Church of Christ differ radically. That of Dr. Headlam could be held by most Free Churchmen: in the Church of South India it is actually held by representatives of the Methodist, Congregational and Presbyterian denominations. The problem of episcopacy, seeing that: "The acceptance of episcopal Ordination for the future would not imply the acceptance of any particular theory as to its origin or character, or the disowning of past ministries of Word and Sacraments otherwise received, which have, together with those received by Episcopal Ordination, been used and blessed by the Spirit of God,"[14] is not so much the result of differences about principles and doctrine as of finding a means for the conferring of episcopacy that will not offend the susceptibilities of either Free Churchmen or Anglicans. The convictions of the High Anglican school, on the other hand, differ but little from our own. The main divergence is on the position of the Pope in the Church. There are some High Anglicans who accept both his infallibility and his universal jurisdiction: what prevents them from submitting themselves to him is the papal condemnation of their Orders: they are striving for corporate reunion on the condition of the recognition of the validity of Anglican Orders and of those other sacraments that depend on that validity. There are others who accept his infallibility but not his universal jurisdiction: and others again, and most, who reject both.

But all unite in holding the papacy in high esteem. "It is obvious that the

[11]) E.L. Mascall: *Op. cit.*, p. 122.
[12]) A.G. Hebert: *The Form of the Church;* (London 1944) pp. 103-4.
[13]) E.L. Mascall: *The Unity of the Church;* Church Quarterly Review, CLII (1950) pp. 38-9. Dr. Mascall is a philosopher and theologian of what Archbishop Temple called the "Neo-Thomist" school of Anglican theology. In his general doctrinal position he is very close to Catholic thought. That is why his views on the Papacy and authority in the Church are of particular interest.
[14]) Negotiations with Free Churches, May 1922: Cf. G.K.A. Bell: *Docs. on Christian Unity;* (London, 1924) p. 150.

Papal Communion owed each of these advantages to the extent to which it had resisted that process of fragmentation of ideas and of life which had overtaken the rest of the West—in a word, to its continued unity. And it is historically obvious that it owed this basic advantage to its retention of the Papacy, as this had developed during the Middle Ages . . . If such an institution as the "universal Church" is to exist as more than a sentiment and an ideal—as a concrete substantial reality within human history in our highly organised modern society—then some such central institution would seem to be more than just a convenience. It is at least a pragmatical necessity, as is shown by the obvious temptation of the modern "oecumenical movement" to try to provide a substitute for it. . . .

"Yet signs have multiplied in recent years, that whenever it (i.e., the Papacy) can forget this sectarianism, and give a deliberate lead to all Christendom, outside as well as inside its own allegiance, on a matter of vital Christian interest, the Papacy can still command the attention and to a large extent secure the following of all Christians, and that it is the only Christian institution which can do so. It is at the head of a full half of Christendom, and that half, moreover, which shows no sign of diminished vitality and coherence. It is at once the strongest single bulwark of the historic tradition of Christian civilisation in Europe, and a pioneer of the modern Christian social teaching by which it is sought to remedy the desperate sickness from which that tradition now universally suffers. It is also the largest single missionary force in the world mission-field today. Above all, it has never wavered in its adherence to the central Christian truths of the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Redemption: for its mighty witness to these all orthodox Christians of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have had cause to be deeply grateful."[15]

But the Papacy is not only a "pragmatical necessity:" it is and always has been, as long at the Church has existed—from Our Lord's time, that is, to this present day—an actual fact, an institution that has given stability, unity and continuity to the Church, not because events happened to work out that way, but because Christ promised and commanded that it should be so: "Thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church:" "feed my sheep." Or, as it has been expressed by an Anglican minister: "From these historical premises and our faith in the rational nature of Our Blessed Lord's work and the assurance of His providential guardianship of His Mystical Body, we are bound to conclude that Peter is of the esse of the Church—he is essential and Peter lives on in the Bishops of Rome."[16] In other words: *Ubi Petrus, ibi ecclesia;* and its converse follows: *Ubi non est Petrus, ibi non est ecclesia.*

Joseph Gill, S.J.

15) *Catholicity,* being a Report presented to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury by a group of Anglicans of the "Catholic" school of thought: (London 1947) pp. 35, 36, 40.
16) F. Bottomley: *The See of Peter and Reunion*: The Pilot I (1947) p. 18.

Device for the Alteration of Religion

THE above title is the name of a schedule drawn up in the last days of Queen Mary Tudor by Sir William Cecil and several other forward-looking figures of the political world by which they hoped to guide the Princess Elizabeth after her presently expected coming to the English throne. They reckoned on her compliance, as they did on the opposition of the bishops. They projected a radical change of the Catholic religion, which save for the attempts to change it during the reign of Edward VI, had been England's heritage for close to a thousand years; it was to be abolished in favor of the new Protestant doctrines imported from Germany. Their *Device for the Alteration of Religion,* as a matter of fact, met with such sweeping success in altering England's religious life that its fortunes became an integral part of the history of the Church of England by law established.

The *Device* and the events which followed upon it have a most significant bearing upon the present day position of most High Church Anglicans. The latter share the Roman position in beliving it a matter of sovereign importance to be affiliated with the one Catholic Church established by Christ, but they vary from it in their conviction that the Church of England was never severed from that Church. Since a problem of such crucial and sacred import calls for most serious attention, we invite them to review with us the relevant historical data, being persuaded that any effort to clarify and establish objective reality, whatever it may be, can only serve to prepare the way for veritable Catholic union.

Could it be possible that the Church of England was never torn away from the body of the Catholic Church, that it in some mystic manner persevered throughout the Reformation period as a part of it? For this to be true, that is, to have remained a part of a whole, it would have to have retained some organic relationship to that whole. It could not, for instance, have stood alone and autonomous in Christendom. Does the Church of England possess real continuity with the historic and Catholic Church in England of pre-Reformation times? Continuity would mean that no organic severance in causes and results between past and present had occurred. The evidence of history runs counter to such an idea of continuity.

Without intending to add anything new to the Anglican case, of which the facts are already well recorded, and worked from every angle, we shall essay to focus the light once again on the central question: When and how did the departure from the Catholic Church occur?

There is no historical doubt that the Church of England was led into schism by King Henry VIII, signalized in the Act of Supremacy of 1534. The schism was grievous enough, but schisms in which the fundamentals of the faith have not been altered and abjured nor the sacraments invalidated can be healed. An attempt to work this more profound destruction was made by Archbishop Cranmer and other ambitious souls as soon as Henry was dead. The minority of the new King opened an opportunity, eagerly seized by the Protestantizing faction in the name of the consumptive boy, Edward VI (1547-1553.) They worked eagerly to bring their religion into conformity with the sects in the German countries, without, however, altogether succeeding. The reign of Edward was too brief for a total meta-

morphosis. Even so, they did an immense amount of damage, and looted the Church thoroughly besides.

Upon the death of Edward, the nation returned to the ancient faith and traditions and, under the patronage of the new monarch, Queen Mary the Catholic, attempted to repair the harm done the Church by the schism of King Henry and the heresy of Edward. The imported foreign Protestants hurried back to the Continent, quickly followed by the native fanatics.

Promptly upon her accession and according to time-honored tradition, Mary sent an embassy to Rome to inform the Pope that she was Queen of England and to sue for pardon for the late heresy of her nation, begging for restoration of unity with the Holy See. Pope Julius III sent Reginald Pole, the Queen's cousin, whom he created a cardinal, as his legate to reconcile the wounded and weakened Church in England to Catholic faith and unity, and to absolve the nation from all heresy and schism.

But, again, the reign was too short. When Queen Mary died, November 17th, 1558, her wily and unpredictable sister, Elizabeth, who had narrowly missed the block by the accident of not being the Duke of Northumberland's daughter-in-law and by hysterical conformity to the restored Catholicism, this lady became the Queen of England.

What would she do? The question is purely rhetorical.

At once the winds changed and blew from Zurich and Geneva again. The Protestantizers had another chance and were not slow to seize it. As soon as it was known that Queen Mary was dead, the temper of Elizabeth, whose very existence had been the occasion of the Henrican schism, was anticipated and the foreigners and emigrants prepared to converge on England again to prosecute their aims anew.

That the Queen and her advisers intended to set the clock back to Protestantism was apparent from the moment of her accession. The Spanish Ambassador, the Count de Feria, thus reported home: "The kingdom is entirely in the hands of young folks, heretics and traitors, and the Queen does not favor a single man whom her Majesty, who is now in heaven, would have received.... She seems to me incomparably more to be feared than her sister was, and gives her orders and has her way as absolutely as her father (Henry VIII) did."[1]

On December 14th, 1558, the state obsequies for the late Queen were celebrated in Westminster Abbey. The Bishop of Winchester, Dr. John White, preached a sermon in which he warned that the Genevan wolves were already approaching to devour the lamb of the Church in England. This sermon is preserved in manuscript in the Cottonian Library and printed in full in Strype's "Memorials of the Reformation."[2]

The Queen was displeasured. The Council sent for Bishop White, and having admonished him, put him under house arrest. The Acts of the Privy Council, January 19th, 1559, (Elizabeth was then safely crowned) record that he was then released, with a fresh admonition and caution.

Lest any fall into like fault, on December 28th, two weeks after Bishop White's sermon, a proclamation was put forth in the Queen's name, commanding "All manner of her subjects.... that they do forbear to preach or teach or to give audience to any manner of doctrine or preaching... until consultation may be had by Parliament, by her Majesty, and her three Es-

[1]) Spanish Calendar, Dec. 14th, 1558.
[2]) Vol. vii, pp. 397-413, ed. 1816.

tates of the realm."[3] This injunction was very carefully exacted of the Catholics but every leeway was granted to their opponents to fulminate at will.

In the meantime, the Queen had already sent up a trial balloon, which became the index of her intention to repudiate the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence and overthrow the Mass itself, for between Catholic and Protestant it was the Mass that mattered. On the first Christmas Day of her reign, the interference of the Queen in the Mass being celebrated in her private chapel by Owen Oglethorpe, the Bishop of Carlisle, is well known. It is to the Bishop's undying credit that he disobeyed the laywoman, the Queen though she be, and by elevating the Host testified to the faith of the Catholic Church. Otherwise, he might have gone far in her Majesty's favor.

This was but a tentative probing, even cautious, to see if further changes might be gradually introduced, preferably with the cooperation of the bishops. The great design is borne out by the document, then secret, later made public, called *Device for the Alteration of Religion in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth.*[4] So much for Elizabeth's reliability . . . the little cloud had appeared in the sky; the storm was brewing in the air.

The Rev. G.E. Phillips (once professor in St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw) in his scholarly and well documented book, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy,* has this to say about the Christmas Day incident: "When Elizabeth thus sacrilegiously attempted to tamper with the mode of offering the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, she was as yet uncrowned; and the incident had the effect of confirming the bishops in their resolution to decline to perform the ceremony of her coronation. (Yet) the Bishop of Carlisle at length undertook the ceremony, after many others had been asked in vain, not as a favorer of heresy, but lest, if no one should anoint her, the Queen should thereby be enraged and more inclined to overthrow religion. Things, moreover, were not yet so desperate as to prevent many from hoping she might be turned from her purpose." This observation, quoted by Phillips, is from the report of the historian, Nicholas Sander to Cardinal Morone, 1561, whom Pope Pius IV had put in charge of English ecclesiastical affairs after the schism had been effected and heresy introduced.

No, Elizabeth took all possible care that none of the rite of traditional crowning be lacking or defective at her coronation lest in some way it later be called in question as not entirely sure and valid. She was crowned in Westminster Abbey on Sunday, January 15th, 1559, and though she was truculent and later sneered at the unction, the ceremonial of the *Liber Regalis* was used, from the same book employed at the coronation of King Richard II in 1377, and Oglethorpe, the Bishop of Carlisle, performed the rites of anointing, tending the oath and crowning. Most of the bishops were present and participated in the accustomed ritual of escorts to the Queen, and paid their homage. The Queen certainly perjured herself in taking the Oath, which her after actions indicated she could have had no intention of honoring. But that falseness was not known at the moment. All things were apparently in order; the affront to the belief of the Church came in the Mass, after the actual coronation. The celebrant of the Mass was the dean of the Queen's chapel, a Dr. Carew, who, at the critical point of consecration,

[3]) Cf. Zurick Letters, 2nd series, Ep. 7: The Zurick Letters represent the collected correspondence of the English Protestants with their foreign Protestant friends.
[4]) Cf. Strype's Annals, vol. i, Appen. p. 4, ed. 1709.

deliberately refrained from elevating the Sacred Host and Chalice, certainly as much from his own bent as from the Queen's express orders.

This mutilation, so symbolic and significant, was indicative of worse to come in religion. Immediately, the bishops, even Carlisle, withdrew to one side and refused to accompany the court when the Queen, now crowned and mistress, left the Abbey for Westminster Hall as was customary.

The Queen and the bishops were thus aligned on opposite sides, the one against the other. It was all too plain that the prelates had judged correctly the temper and intentions of their mistress in the matter of religion and had determined themselves to oppose any changes. Later, de Feria reported to King Philip of Spain, "All the bishops here are determined to die for the Faith and your Majesty would be surprised to see how firm and steadfast they have been and are."

The gage was down. But what to do with the stiff-necked bishops? The test would come in Parliament; then it would be seen whether the ancient hierarchy must be swept clean away or not in order to set the clock back to the lamentable times of King Edward VI or even Henry VIII. However undesirable such drastic action would be, if the bishops would not bend or cooperate, an altogether new hierarchy would have to be substituted to carry out the device for the alteration of religion. The Queen and her chief minister, Sir William Cecil (later Lord Burghley,) were determined on that; these two were certainly the hope of the Protestants as well as the despair of the Catholics.

Parliament assembled at Westminster on January 25th. The proceedings began with a religious ceremony in the Abbey at which the Queen was again truculent and rude to the Lord Abbot Feckenham and his monks who went in procession to the door to greet her. One Cox, later intruded into the see of Ely in the rightful bishop's place (Thomas Thirlby,) and a fanatical Genevan, preached a diatribe lasting an hour and a half, at the end praising the Queen as the God-given instrument for altering religion. Far from rebuking such presumption, as had been done in the case of Bishop White, she complacently received the tribute.

The composition of the House of Commons had been hand-picked to favor change. Letters Patent had been issued to the sheriffs and mayors with approved lists of persons to be sent up for Parliament. But the House of Lords was another matter. In the Lords two estates of the realm sat, the Lords Temporal and the Lords Spiritual, and though they comprised but one House, the two estates were supposed to concur in the passage of any measure brought up to them from the Commons. The Lords Spiritual were to a man ready to resist any change in religion that would throw it back into the confusion of Edward's day, and the Lords Temporal were for the most part conservatives too. Sixteen bishops were at the time living who had seats in the House of Lords. Five were, however, absent, two from illness, two on business of state abroad (Thirlby of Ely returned before Parliament adjourned,) and one, Bishop Goldwell of St. Asalph, on a technicality, received no writ of summons from Cecil, the Lord Chancellor. In the Lords Temporal, a make-weight of five new peers was hastily created, all of the innovating or reforming party.

This was the first Parliament of the new reign. It sat from January 25th to May 8th, 1559. For religion it was a fatal one for it contrived the formal establishment of the Church of England, reenacting the Royal Supremacy

which automatically created again the schism from Rome, and reauthorizing the heretical, scrambled Protestant liturgy composed by Cranmer and imposed on the nation during Edward's reign.

Due to the mental color of the Commons, achieved by design, there was little difficulty in effecting the retrograde aims of the Queen and her advisers and ministers. It was enough that the Queen "wished it." But the contest came in the Lords; here a stubborn stand was made by the bishops. The prelates were determined not to give in.

Bishop Scott of Chester, speaking before the peers, said, when the new schism was projected. . . . "The bishops and clergy of this realm of England in the Convocation of 1534, by which the authority of the Bishop of Rome was abolished and disallowed, that were the doers there (of the schism,) so many as be dead, before they died, were penitent and cried God mercy for their act; and those that do live, as all your lordships know hath openly revoked the same, acknowledging their error. (This, of course, refers to the absolution and reconciliation of 1554.) He which once ran so hastily or so rashly that he has overthrown himself and fallen and broken his brow or his shin will take heed to walk more warily, as we have seen by the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ, which did all forsake Him and run away when He was apprehended by the Jews, and especially St. Peter, which did thrice deny Him. And yet after, as well Peter as all the rest of the Apostles did return to their Master, Christ, and never would after, for neither persecution nor death, forsake or deny Him any more."[5]

Nicholas Heath, the Archbishop of York, who had resigned the Great Seal as Lord Chancellor upon Elizabeth's accession (she then gave it to Cecil,) was the ranking prelate in the realm, as the Archbishopric of Canterbury was vacant upon the death of Reginald, Cardinal Pole, the last Catholic occupant of the see founded under the authority of Pope St. Gregory the Great by St. Augustine who had so many eminent and sainted successors. Cardinal Pole had expired on the same date as Queen Mary. Dr. Heath held the proxies of all the bishops, and spoke in their name and for them before the Parliament. In defense of maintaining the Catholic religion, he applied the scalpel of law and logic to what it was proposed this Parliament should do to alter the same, that is, to receive the Act of Supremacy. He said:

"First, when by virtue of this Act of Supremacy, we must forsake and flee from the See of Rome, it should be considered by your wisdoms what matter lieth therein in danger or inconvenience. Secondly, it should be considered what this supremacy is, and whether it do consist in spiritual government or temporal. If in temporal, what further authority can this House give unto her Highness than she hath already. If in spiritual, it should be considered whether this House can grant it; and whether her Highness is an apt person to receive the same.

"To the first point . . . if by this our relinquishing of the See of Rome there be none other matter therein than a withdrawing of our obedience from the Pope's person . . . then the cause were not of such great importance as it is in very deed; when by relinquishing and forsaking the See of Rome we must forsake and flee from these four things. First, we must forsake and flee from all General Councils. Secondly, we must flee from all canonical and ecclesiastical laws of the Church of Christ. Third, from the judgement of

[5]) Phillips, *The Extinction of the Ancient Hierarchy*, p. 75, quoted from *Elizabeth and the Catholic Hierarchy* by the Rev. T.E. Bridgett, p. 21, in turn from Strype's preservation of Bishop Scott's speech.

all other Christian princes. Fourth and last, we must forsake and flee from the unity of Christ's Church, and by leaping out of Peter's Ship, hazard ourselves to be overwhelmed and drowned in the waters of schism, sects, and divisions."[6]

St. Thomas More had used this very argument, almost the same words, when he defied the tyranny of Henry VIII in this same question of royal supremacy, and therefore lost his head to gain a martyr's crown. The waters of schisms, sects, and divisions the Archbishop knew of only too well from experience and the harm that had been done to the religion of the realm. John Feckenham, the Lord Abbot of the Marian-restored Abbey of Westminster, likewise bore testimony before the Lords of the dire consequences of the same. He said:

"In her Majesty's late reign, your lordships may remember how quiet and governable the people were. It was not their custom to prescribe to authority, to run before the laws, and disobey the proclamations of their sovereign. There was then no sacrilegious rapine, no plundering of churches, no blasphemous outrage and trampling of the holy sacraments under their feet. . . . In the late reign, the generality of the people, and particularly the nobility and those of the Privy Council, were exemplary for their public devotion; it being the custom to go to church or chapel to beg the protection of God before they entered upon the business of the day."[7]

Furthermore, the history of religion in England since the Elizabethan schism only too well bears out the truth of Archbishop Heath's foreboding for confusion of sects and dissent has ever since been rife among the English people, without any semblance of religious unity in the nation, and with a bloody civil war into the bargain.

The Archbishop went on to prove the consequences of his four points, and especially the nature of the spiritual government it was proposed to confer upon the Queen. He spoke first of the binding and loosing which our Lord gave to St. Peter, then. . . . "It should be considered of your wisdoms whether you have sufficient authority to grant unto her Highness this first point of spiritual government, and to say to her 'Tibi dabimus claves regni caelorum.' If you say yea, then we require the right of your warrant and commission by virtue of God's Word. And if you say no, then you may be well assured . . . that you have no such sufficient authority to make her Highness Supreme Head of the Church here in this realm. . . . And further, that her Highness, being a woman by birth and nature, is not qualified by God's Word to feed the Flock of Christ."

As for the authority of the Provinces of Canterbury and York, which comprised the Church in England, even had they wished to do so of their own volition, to separate from the unity of the Catholic Church and constitute themselves an autonomous body with powers to make alterations in the traditional and accepted faith of Christendom, Bishop Scott of Chester averred: ". . . a particular or provincial council can make no determination against the Universal Church of Christ." Yet that is exactly what the English Queen and her councillors proposed to force the English Church to do and though they were unable to gain their ends by ecclesiastical subservience, they stifled the Church in order to establish their own organization by Parliamentary action.

[6]) Phillips, pp. 73, 74; and Strype, Annals, vol. i, Ed. 1709.
[7]) Cottonian library, Vesp. D., xviii, vol. 8.

To quote Sander's report to Morone again: "Whenever any question was raised referring to religion (in the first Parliament of Elizabeth) the Archbishop of York always protested that that was not its proper place; that such questions ought to be discussed in a Synod, not in Parliament, and by bishops, not by laymen. Then the bishops each in order said that they were of the same mind, nor did any one of them on any question ever differ from another . . . who allowed no point to pass without pursuing it so thoroughly as to make it impossible to answer their speeches. The thing was indeed unheard of, inasmuch as the laymen had nothing which they could say on any point; and yet, whilst they acknowledged their admiration for the talent and learning of the bishops, they always gave, as their one reason for differing from them, that they understood the Queen wished it."[8]

That the Church was not unaware of the designs against her freedom and prerogatives is evident from the fact that Convocation (the canonical synod of the Church in England) assembled at the same time as the Parliament to lend its support to the bishops in their momentous struggle against the civil power. This body was unanimous in thinking it their duty to make clear to the laymen sitting in Parliament their minds and opinions upon crucial questions, as their right and privilege. Convocation subscribed to a set of resolutions: "1st, that they believed in the real and natural presence of the Body of Christ in the Eucharist . . . and that this is the Catholic faith and accordance with Gospel truth. 2nd, that they believed the Mass to be the propitiatary sacrifice for the living and the dead. 3rd, that they believed the Roman Pontiff to be the Head of the Church and the Vicar of Jesus Christ. 4th, that laymen ought not to discuss sacred questions and much less make laws concerning them."[9]

Notwithstanding this bold stand in union with the opposition of the bishops in the House of Lords, no attention was paid to the Declaration which Convocation presented to Parliament, and, furthermore, the bishops were led into a trap of argumentation rigged against them from the start. And for one excuse or another, or some trumped up charge of contumacy, bishop after bishop was eliminated from Parliament. Two (White of Winchester and Watson of Lincoln) were summarily sent to the Tower. Some resigned their offices and some were forcibly deprived, and ultimately, all save one (Kitchin of Llandaff) were imprisoned and so ill treated that they subsequently died from the rigors of their confinement, without ever regaining their rightful and canonical jurisdictions.

The Act of Supremacy was carried in spite of everything, with, however, the elimination of the whole bench of bishops, one of the essential estates of the realm from time immemorial. Never had there been a more flagrant miscarriage of law: Convocation ignored and the Church emasculated. Elizabeth, at her own request, received the title of Governess of the Church instead of the Henrican title Head, though the term implied all the powers of spiritual government. Was that logomachy a typical Elizabethan compromise and a last desperate trick to lure the bishops into complaisance and the betrayal of the Church? Or was it merely in respect to her sex?

The new Act of Supremacy was quickly followed by an Act of Uniformity (never was one more equivocally styled) just as though uniformity in worship did not already exist in the Catholic and accustomed liturgy. This

[8]) Cf. Phillips, pp. 72-73.
[9]) Phillips, p. 7.

measure brought into use, by law, the strange and heretical Prayer Book of Cranmer cast out by national and ecclesiastical authority in 1554. The Act enjoyed every minister, whether benificed or not, the exclusive use of this strange book (now hailed as 'our incomparable liturgy,' which indeed it is, not being like anything else in all Christian liturgies,) and the whole of the ancient and familiar liturgy of the Catholic Church was repudiated. The bill passed the Lords with a bare majority of three! How eager the Queen: how eager the nation!

Now followed an oath of enforcement, with heavy penalties attached. Without apostacy it could be taken by no conscientious Catholic, nor would the bishops take it, nor hundreds of others. Here was the formal parting of the ways, unity severed and liturgy, the bulwark and safeguard of doctrine, discarded; there only remained the obdurate bishops, without whom the Church could not be dragooned.

Is it, therefore, any wonder that this stubborn episcopate must, in the eyes of the Queen and Cecil, be displaced and an entirely new hierarchy intruded which would conform to the changes in religion? But that was difficult; some semblance of legal continuity must be preserved for the sake of appearances in order to deceive the people and to bring the nation round to the new ways of religion without their suspecting too radical a departure. As the episcopate was the crucial institution, some sort of episcopate must be instituted to carry on. As for the lesser clergy, they could conform or else be swept out of sight without scruple by the mere power of the Crown, and in due time they would die off. The new hierarchy, state-appointed and state-controlled, would gradually replace the old order with a new order of bishops and clergy, and the people would have to submit, or else . . .

So, by November, not a rightful bishop was in possession of his see, save Llandaff, who by that time was weakly conforming, isolated as well from his old colleagues on the bench as from the new prelates to be. But in the meantime, that is, between midsummer 1559, when the new laws went into effect, and December, when the Elizabethan nominee took possession of Canterbury, some of the legalistic forms were attempted through the bishops still not in prison to give color to the new order of things by obtaining their confirmation for the Queen's candidate for Canterbury.

It was out of the question, in the light of the new order and policy, to entrust Canterbury to any one of the existing rightful bishops, nor would any of them even have considered accepting that metropolitan see, having all seen the trend of events and refused to take the Oath of Uniformity. The crew of returned emigrants was eager and waiting to receive the formal authority from the Governess of the Church to begin their work of demolition and turning everything upsidedown. This was too patent. Elizabeth passed them by for the nonce; they could be given sees later, all in good time. She chose instead one Matthew Parker, a married cleric of Lutheran views who, by the leniency of Queen Mary, had lived in retirement after the Catholic religion was restored in 1554.

To secure confirmation of his nomination, Letters Patent were addressed to Cuthbert Tunstall, Bishop of Durham and after Heath's retirement ranking prelate in the old but fast disappearing order, and three other bishops still in possession of their sees, and two bishops without jurisdiction. These prelates refused point blank to confirm Parker's nomination. They had no stomach to compromise themselves in what they quite rightly knew to be an

illegal and subversive scheme, and quite irregular to boot. Cecil was in despair; some gesture of legal procedure seemed indispensable. The law of the land required for the confirmation of a new archbishop of Canterbury a metropolitan and three provincials, or at least four bishops holding sees. Cecil wrote: "There is no archbishop, nor any bishops to be had."[10]

There were, however, a number of suffragans whose orders at least were valid but who were without jurisdiction. Some had gone into retirement, and those still beneficed were disinclined to involve themselves in the questionable changes being imposed by the Crown. For fear of a snub, such as had already been delivered from the other bishops, Cecil dared not risk approaching them.

He turned instead to certain learned clerks and canon lawyers who were avowed Protestants or favorable to heresy, all only too subservient to the Queen. These lawyers averred, in view of the unprecedented and pressing nature of the situation, for which there was no law to be found, that a new Commission might be issued to the now backsliding Kitchin and certain other persons once in bishop's orders and known to be sympathetic to the current changes. But Kitchin had enough principle and conscience left to refuse, though it might have meant great advancement for him later. The other gentlemen were either in invalid orders (from Edward's day) or unfrocked and even excommunicate. To serve would mean recognition and restitution for them however fly-blown their characters and records.

So, by this dodge, the custom and the law got some sort of honoring, as far as was possible under the bizarre circumstances of the time. The next step was to proceed to some sort of consecration of Parker. He had already been elected by a minority of the Chapter of Canterbury. The Holy See was wholly honored in the breach of all Catholic custom and law.

But a new difficulty presented itself, though a technicality to be sure. No legal form of consecration remained in existence! The ancient Pontifical had just been set aside by law, while the Edwardian rite, such as it might be, was not then included in the Prayer Book legalized by the Act of Uniformity. Moreover, the complacent "bishops" were indifferent to or even opposed to any semblance of a sacramental rite. Here was a quandary indeed!

Something had to be done. The commissioning, later dubbed consecration, of Parker, took place on Sunday, the 17th of December, and was performed privately, in a sense surreptitiously, in the chapel at Lambeth Palace. Why not in Canterbury Cathedral?

The altar had already been torn out as being too much a reminder of the Mass. At the east end of the chapel now stood a table covered by a carpet, with a cushion upon it. The ceremony took place very early in the morning, with maimed rites. There was not even the imitation of a Mass. The participating clerics were quite capable of making a travesty of whatever ceremony used. There was Matins and Litany in English, then a sermon, then the consecration.

The officiants were, first, William Barlow who had "resigned" in Mary's time, as being "married." Then, John Hodgkins, once suffragan of Bedford and a chronic turncoat, who had, however, been validly consecrated in 1537. He was now without faculties (save by the pleasure of Cecil) and in heresy. Then there was John Scory, a violent and fanatical Irishman who had been

[10]) *States Papers, Domestic, Queen Elizabeth,* vol. v. July 1559.

unfrocked and excommunicated for immorality; and Miles Coverdale, also an Edwardian prelate and a pronounced Lutheran.

What these gentlemen's intentions were in conferring the so-called episcopate on Parker is more than doubtful; as was the intention of the Government; actually the old Church had gone out of existence. The four participants were Protestants at heart and therefore cannot be presumed to have had any intention of conferring sacramental Catholic orders. Certainly, in the form of words they used, there was no indication of what or any office to which the ordinand was admitted. Each said over him: "Take thou the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up by the grace of God which is in thee by the imposition of our hands, for God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and love and soberness." Here was something novel indeed; what did the words imply?

Thus, by the plenitude of the Queen's authority and by law established, the episcopate and the liturgy of the Catholic Church swept away, the new Church of England came into existence. Parker's election, confirmation and the rite of consecration in both matter and form as well as intention, all alike defective, suspect and new, unknown and unprecedented in Catholic Christendom.

From Parker is ever since drawn the hierarchy, prelates and lower clergy too, of the entire Anglican Communion. The *Device for the Alteration of Religion* had only too well succeeded.

T. Bowyer Campbell

Lex Orandi – Lex Credendi

The Divine Office in Religious Communities of the Anglican Communion (*)

THREE AND a half centuries ago it looked as if the leaders of the Reformation movement in England had managed to suppress the recitation of the Divine Office, but, like a seed buried in the ground, it has come up again and grown into a mighty tree. This startling development of liturgical worship in religious communities in communion with Canterbury throughout the world, which started little more than a hundred years ago, is a phenomenon which all those who are interested in the cause of Unity among Christians should study, for it indicates which way the wind is blowing, so to say. The fact that the spiritual life of almost all the many religious communities of men and women in the Church of England and in its overseas Provinces, as well as in the American Episcopal Church, is based on the *opus Dei cui nihil praeponatur* of St. Benedict is something which unites Catholics very closely to them. For what could be more important than having a common method of corporate prayer? *Lex orandi* is well calculated to generate *lex credendi* if two bodies start with the same approach to God. Indeed it is not unreasonable to hope that in the long run they will be united in belief as well as in prayer, even if "the mills of God grind slowly."

Unlike the other Reformed Churches in Europe the Church of England retained the principal elements of the Breviary in the Prayer Book Offices of Mattins and Evensong, so the traditional method of public worship was not abandoned completely in the 16th century. Moreover the daily recitation of these two Offices was made obligatory to Clerks in Holy Orders. But even this was not enough to satisfy the piety of the more devout Anglican clergy and laity. There were always individuals here and there who recited the Canonical Hours from vernacular Diurnals, such as Bishop Cosin's *Collection of Private Devotions in the Practice of the Ancient Church*, called *The Hours of Prayer;* George Hickes' *Devotions in the Ancient Way of Offices;* Mrs. Hopton's manual based on John Austin's Catholic *Book of Offices;* and Dorrington's *Reformed Devotions disposed into the form and method of the Roman Breviary.* From time to time plans were made to establish "Protestant Monasteries" or "Colleges of Maids," as they were called, but nothing came of them. The only community which did materialize was that of Little Gidding, where Nicholas Ferrar and his household of men, women and children lived a life of prayer and good works which resembled that of the first Christians. They were not content with reciting prayers at the Canonical Hours during the day; they rose during the night for watches of prayer, as if they were Carthusian or Cistercian monks, or Poor Clare nuns. The call of the cloister was heard faintly but clearly again and again, yet there were no ways in which it could be answered in the Church of England.

Then in the second decade of the 19th century, Robert Southey, the Poet Laureate, asked why there were no Béguines or Sisters of Charity in the Anglican Church. With the publication of the first of the *Tracts for the*

*) I am indebted to an article by the Rev. Thomas J. Williams, entitled *Anglican Versions of the Breviary* (reprinted from *Cowley*) for much of the information given in this article. Other facts have been gathered from the same author's *Priscilla Lydia Sellon* (S.P.C.K., London, 1950.) Thanks are also due to the Superiors of many Anglican Communities who have supplied facts about their Office Books.

Times in 1833, the dry bones of Anglicanism began to stir. It is significant that *Tract* 75, which appeared three years later, should have been entitled *The Roman Breviary as Embodying the Substance of the Devotional Needs of the Catholic Church.* Its author, John Henry Newman, encourages some of his disciples to make a start on a translation of the Breviary which was never completed, although a few portions were published. In his so-called "monastery" at Littlemore, near Oxford, he initiated the recitation of the Breviary among Anglicans, thus forming a tradition which has continued ever since. It was the Catholic way of prayer that helped more than anything else to hasten his Road to Rome. About six months before Newman and his companions at Littlemore had made their submission to the Holy See of Rome, the first Anglican Sisterhood of the Holy Cross, Park Village West, London, had started the recitation of a carefully expurgated version of the Sarum Breviary prepared under the auspices of Dr. Pusey. For fear of the Bishop of London, all legendary matter from the Second Nocturn Lessons at Matins, all invocations of Our Lady and the Saints, and all prayers for the departed were omitted.

In 1848 the Sisterhood of St. Mary the Virgin, Wantage, began to base its spiritual life on a translation of the Sarum Day Hours which had been made by Mr. Albany Christie. That same year the Sisterhood of the Most Holy Trinity at Devonport followed the example of Wantage, but used manuscript translations of the Salisbury Breviary. In 1851 Sister Amelia Warren started a complete translation of this Breviary, but it was not published until 1889, with the title *The Breviary of the Renowned Church of Salisbury, Translated into English According to the Use of the Society of the Holy Trinity, Devonport.* This vernacular Office Book is still used by this Community at Ascot Priory, England, but has never been adopted by any other Anglican Sisterhood. The Rev. John Mason Neale, founder of the Society of St. Margaret, East Grinstead, translated portions of the Breviary for this Sisterhood which was established in 1854. They did not appear in book form until after his death. The first of the three volumes of *The Night Office of the Church* was published in 1870; followed by *Breviary Offices from Lauds to Compline* in 1877. These books are based on the Sarum Breviary but contain many features taken from Roman, French, and other liturgical books. They were adopted by many other Anglican communities and have been re-issued and revised several times.

As early as 1854 Canon Liddon, while Vice-Principal of Cuddesdon Theological College, had brought out a vernacular Diurnal (*Hours of Prayer*) for the use of the students. It was due to Liddon's influence that Sir Francis Lygon, who became Lord Beauchamp, set to work on *The Day Hours of the Church of England* which was published in 1858, and which soon became the most widely used of all Anglican Office Books. It was adopted by the Communities of St. Mary the Virgin, Wantage; St. John the Baptist, Clewer; Holy Cross, London Docks, and many others. There were not a few Anglican Bishops as well as the more devout laity who started to use *The Day Hours* as a help to their private devotions. So popular did it become that a smaller edition, containing only the Little Hours, was issued, and in some cases bound up with the *Book of Common Prayer.* Between 1858 and 1898 five editions of *The Day Hours of the Church of England* were published, and more than 27,000 copies sold—a proof of the increasing attraction for the recitation of the Breviary Offices among Anglicans. This

Diurnal has since been revised and enriched more than once. The latest edition (1950,) entitled *The Day Hours of the Church* has its Kalendar made to "correspond to the Western Use," and contains the Roman Offices for the feasts of Sacred Heart, Christ the King, and SS. Thomas More and John Fisher.

Another vernacular Diurnal was *The Day Office of the Church, according to the Kalendar of the Church of England,* the first edition of which appeared about 1867. Unlike previous Anglican Office Books, this was based on the *Horae Diurnae* of the Roman Breviary. It was adopted by several communities in England and by at least four in the United States, and was much used by Anglican clergymen. In 1910 Fr. Trenholme, S.S.J.E., brought out another version of the Sarum Day Hours, entitled *Hours of Prayer from Lauds to Compline,* but which was enriched by additional matter from other Breviaries. This book is used by several communities in England and North America as well as by the Society of St. John the Evangelist. In 1927 the Order of the Holy Cross (West Park, New York) issued the first Anglican translation of the Day Hours of the revised Roman Breviary of Pius X (1910.)

The Priest's Book of Private Devotions, published in 1872, contained simplified versions of the Little Hours of the Sarum Breviary. These were reissued subsequently in a little book entitled *Prime and the Hours,* which has had a wide use in all parts of the Anglican Communion, not only by Religious Communities but by individual clergymen and layfolk. Later editions were edited by Fr. Frere of the Community of the Resurrection. In 1950 this Community published a handy little Breviary for the use of its members, containing the Prayer Book Offices of Mattins and Evensong, together with the lesser Hours taken from *Prime and the Hours,* with the Kalendar enriched with many saints not found in the *Book of Common Prayer.* A few Anglican Sisterhoods in the last century drew up Office Books for themselves, e.g. the Society of the Holy and Undivided Trinity at Oxford, which in 1872 brought out a three volume edition of the Day and Night Hours of the Roman Breviary. Most of the translating was done by Philip Pusey, son of Dr. Pusey.

Ever since the foundation of the first Anglican Benedictine community of men at Claydon, Suffolk, in 1863, by Fr. Ignatius, who moved his monks to Llanthony in 1870, there had been a demand for a vernacular version of the *Breviarium Monasticum.* These monks and the nuns, who were established soon afterwards, had to content themselves with manuscript translations. The celebration of the Work of God cannot have been easy under such conditions! It was not until 1916 that the first Anglican edition of the Benedictine Night Office appeared; the translation having been made by Canon Winfred Douglas, chaplain of the Community of St. Mary, Peekskill, New York. Two years later this Community printed for its own use a vernacular version of the Benedictine Day Hours. After it had been revised, it was published by the Oxford University Press in 1932, under the title of *The Monastic Diurnal.* This book has been adopted by numerous Anglican communities of men and women in all parts of the world, and seems to be superseding other vernacular Diurnals to a great extent.

At least one Anglican Sisterhood (the Community of St. Mary at the Cross, Edgware, Middlesex) started the recitation of the Day Hours in Latin as early as 1870, but it was not until the foundation of the Benedictine community of men in 1896, and which moved to Caldey Island, South Wales, in 1906, that the complete *Breviarium Monasticum* was adopted by any

Anglican religious. There is no doubt that it was largely due to this use of an unexpurgated form of Catholic liturgical prayer that the monks of Caldey found their way into the Catholic Church in 1913. By 1908 the Anglican Benedictine nuns at West Malling had started to use the *Breviarium Monasticum,* and they too discovered their *lex credendi* through a *lex orandi.* Since the reception into the Church of these two communities in 1913 several other Anglican communities have adopted either the Roman or the Monastic Breviary in Latin. These include the monks of Nashdom Abbey (with their American Priory at Three Rivers, Michigan;) the nuns of Malling Abbey, Kent; the Society of the Salutation, Burford, Oxford; and the Community of St. Peter, Lalaham Abbey—all of which use the *Breviarium Monasticum.* The Community of the Holy Cross, Haywards Heath, Sussex, founded in 1855, has also taken to the Monastic Breviary in Latin, and like the other communities mentioned above, uses the *Missale Romanum* instead of the Communion rite of the Book of Common Prayer. The Society of the Precious Blood at Burnham Abbey, Buckinghamshire—an enclosed and contemplative Sisterhood, whose observances are based on those Canonesses Regular of the Lateran of Perpetual Adoration—recite their Office from the *Breviarium Romanum,* and follow the *Ordo* of the Catholic Diocese of Westminister in which their convent is situated.

But this urge to use Latin is not widespread among Anglican religious. The three communities of the strictly enclosed and purely contemplative Sisters of the Love of God recite the full Office in English. The two convents in England which observe the Cistercian Rule have their own vernacular Office Books. The Society of the Sacred Cross, Tymawr, Monmouthshire, is bringing out a translation of the Benedictine Office of Matins. The male Franciscan communities of the Society of St. Francis, the Brotherhood of the Holy Cross, and the Society of the Divine Compassion, each recite the Day Hours in English. The American Episcopalian Poor Brothers of St. Francis and Poor Clares of Reparation and Adoration state that they "follow the Breviary used by the Order of St. Francis."

Plainchant books to use with the vernacular Offices are now available, most of them edited by the late Dr. Palmer, and published by the Community of St. Mary the Virgin, Wantage. These include an English plainchant Psalter, the Offices of Vespers and Compline, and a complete musical edition of the Sarum Day Hours, entitled *The Diurnal Noted.*

This list of Anglican Diurnals is by no means complete, e.g. there was *The Book of Hours,* compiled by the Rev. Morgan Dix of Trinity Church, New York, which appeared in 1866—the first translation of the Breviary Offices to be published in the United States. Then there is *The Day Hours and Other Offices as Used by the Sisters of All Saints,* translated from the Roman Breviary by Sister Maria Francesca, sister of Christiana and Dante Gabriel Rosetti. It was revised and republished in 1921 under the title of *A Book of Day Hours for the Use of Religious Societies,* and with many of the reforms of Pius X adopted.

It is worth mentioning that in almost all Anglican communities of men and women the Divine Office is arranged in such a way that every three hours or so the bell rings to summon the members to choir. Even in the most active communities which are engaged in works of mercy and charity the spiritual life is based on the recitation of the Day Hours, such has been the case from the foundation of the first Anglican Sisterhood in 1845. It is

very common to find convents where continuous intercessory prayer is kept up by the Sisters throughout the day, not only in enclosed and contemplative houses, but in the communities which are occupied with teaching, nursing, and other forms of an external apostolate. There are many Sisterhoods where the private recitation of the Rosary is encouraged in addition to the celebration of the Divine Office in choir.

Thus it will be realized how much Catholics—at least those who are liturgically minded—have in common with the members of religious Communities in communion with Canterbury. It is good to remember this in these times when it is much more important to stress what Christians share than what are their points of difference.

PETER F. ANSON

Catholics and Dissident Orientals . . .

Irenic Statements of the Metropolitan of Chios

During the last Octave of prayer for the reunion of all Christians in one sole Church, the dissident Greek Bishop Panteleimon, Metropolitan of Chios, made some remarkable statements that well merit the consideration of everyone working for the cause of Christian unity. They appeared in the form of an article in the Paris daily *Le Monde* of January 26, 1952. The following passage is taken from it:

"From the depths of Christian hearts continued prayers for Church unity surge up. The Eastern Orthodox Church of Christ, in all its liturgical offices prays for the stability of the holy Churches of God and for the union of all . . . The Catholic Church also never ceases praying for the same intention, and for this purpose organizes public meetings and prayers. All the other Churches that believe in Christ as Saviour of the World, Son of God incarnated for our salvation pray that the Churches be united in one sole society, one, holy, catholic and apostolic."

He says that this universal longing would already have been accomplished, the will of the Lord would have been achieved, if anti-Christian fanaticism had not prevailed in the hearts of a great number of the leaders and of the people as well. He continues:

"*Between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church, it is fanaticism alone, that has emphasized the insignificant differences, differences that were never serious, that existed in former times without bringing about a schism.*" On the other hand, all those who are acquainted with the situation should be convinced that the Christian conscience demands union. "*The two most ancient Churches, the Orthodox and the Catholic, should fall in to the arms one of another, weep over their past, and then, purified by the tears of contrition, appeal to the divine Power, and through their reconciliation, give their peoples the joy of the Lord.*" Immediately afterward, the Anglican Church should unite, as well as all the other Christian Churches that believe in one God and three persons, in the divinity of the Word made Flesh, in the Redemption through the shedding of His Blood, in the last Judgment and final retribution, and the transmission of divine grace through the holy mysteries. All should unite, leaving fanaticism behind, resolved to accept the grace of God's mercy.

What the Metropolitan of Chios calls *fanaticism* would probably be more properly understood as the *polemical spirit,* that is, the tendency to consider the Christians who do not belong to one's own Church as adversaries and enemies. This hostile attitude is in evidence especially at the beginnings of schisms and heresies, and this may easily be understood. The moment for crying "Wolf!" is when the wolf is actually ravaging the fold. Unfortunately, it happens that this hostitity continues, even after the organizers of the schisms and heresies have long disappeared, and when one has to do with dissidents, who are in no way guilty of the sin of schism and heresies, with persons born in the land where the error has prevailed for many generations. St. Augustine has written in this regard:

"One must not count among the heretics those who, without stubborn anger defend their doctrine even if it be false and perverse, above all if they are not themselves the authors of it, having received it from parents

already seduced and fallen into error, if they seek truth with prudent solicitude, ready to embrace it once they have found it."[1]

During the course of the centuries, these sage words of the great doctor of the Church have not always been recalled. The polemical spirit of the beginnings has persevered, making the reestablishment of union impossible. This is especially true of relations between Greeks and Latins during all the period of the Middle Ages, and down to our own times. Metropolitan Panteleimon is quite right when he says, *"Between the Orthodox Church and the Catholic Church, it is fanaticism, and fanaticism alone that has emphasized the insignificant differences, differences that were never serious, that existed in former times without bringing about a schism."*

One need only read, with a fair and unbiased mind, the history of the Byzantine schism. One will find that the beliefs, usages, and customs that served as pretext for separation throughout the Middle-Ages, some of which stand as obstacles to union even today, already existed in the Western Church long before Photius, and much longer before Michael Cerularius, without provoking a breach with the Oriental Church. In the Fourth Century and even before, belief in the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son (*ex Patre Filioque—ab utroque*) was held unanimously in the West. In the greater part of the Western Churches the word *Filioque* had been added to the Creed before Photius, without any intention of casting a challenge before the Orientals who had not made this addition, but who currently said that the Holy Ghost proceeds *from the Father through the Son,* and even went so far as to say *from the Father and from the Son.* The very uncle of Photius, St. Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the midst of an ecumenical council, the second of Nicea (787,) had declared in his profession of faith: I believe in the Holy Ghost, who proceeds *from the Father through the Son.* This same profession of faith had been approved by the Roman legates as well as by the Oriental bishops.

As for the primacy of St. Peter and his successor, the Bishop of Rome, a primacy not merely of honour, but one of true authority, today considered the great obstacle to union, one need but read, with the polecmial spirit put aside, the acts of the ancient ecumenical councils, notably of the Council of Ephesus (431,) of the Council of Chalcedon (451,) of the third Council of Constantinople (681) and of the second of Nicea (787.) One will find there such numerous and such explicit affirmations of this primacy that the present attitude of the Oriental dissidents with regard to the Roman Pontiff become incomprehensible. To the declarations of the councils should be added the perfectly clear teaching of the Oriental Fathers whose feasts are solemnly celebrated by the Byzantine Church: St. Ephrem, St. Tarasius, St. Nicephorus, St. Theodore the Studite, St. Ignatius of Constantinople, St. Methodius, Apostle of the Slavs, Photius himself, and so on.

Then, if we pass to the usages that have been brought forward to legitimize the separation, they are first of all in themselves of singular insignificance, and merit no lenghthy consideration. Furthermore it has been historically established that they existed, for the greater part before Photius and before Michael Cerularius . . . We have in mind especially the question of the azymes, that have caused so much ink to flow, and to which a most exorbitant importance has been attached. Should we speak of the Saturday

[1]) Epist. 162, *P.L.*, vol. 33, col. 160. This passage had been inserted in the ancient *Corpus juris,* Caus. 24 Qu. 3. Cap., *Dixit Apostolus,* 29.

fast, the use of eggs and milk products in the first week of Lent, of the suppression of the *Alleluja* during the holy Forty Days, of the clean-shaven faces of the Latin clerics, and of so many other tiresome details that have given increment to the controversies? It is enough to make one blush with shame even to think of the offspring to which our ancestors' polemical spirit has given birth. Our fathers have sinned, our fathers are no more, and we bear the punishment for their crimes. Let us cast off at least, to the measure that it is in our power, the morbid inheritance that they have left us by renouncing fanaticism and the polemical spirit, by considering one another, and treating one another as brothers in Christ; by working for the unity of spirits in truth and the union of hearts in charity.

Certainly, Metropolitan Panteleimon is right. At the present time, no serious motives exist which should impede the two Churches, the Roman and the Byzantine, to unite with each other, which should keep them from falling into the arms of one another. In the past there never was a valid reason for separation, but there have been pretexts in the political or emotional order. In our days, even these pretexts no longer exist. This is why, as the Metropolitan of Chios says, the Christian conscience demands union . . . A reason for good hope is the first step towards reconciliation already made by His Holiness Pope Pius XII at the time of his accession to the sovereign Pontificate. The Holy Father has notice of his election sent to the Patriarch of Constantinople, as was done in former times when their was no schism. In like manner, the new Patriarch of Constantinople, His Blessedness Athenagoras, did as much at the time of his recent election.

How easy it would be to reestablish union between Rome and Constantinople in these days! What would be necessary? Put back the name of the Pope in the Phanar's diptychs, and recognize his primacy as it was recognized in the ancient ecumenical councils: his primacy and doctrinal infallibility as well, as the latter was acclaimed at Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Byzantine Patriarch was accused of having instigated the schism of the 11th Century. We should admit that at that distant time all the wrongs were not on his side. The arrogant attitude and the seething polemical attacks of Cardinal Humbert had their part in the matter. Let us wipe away the memory of the past and embrace one another, as the Metropolitan of Chios invites us to do. The Patriarch of Constantinople would be invested with glory never to be forgot, and would merit the gratitude of all Christendom, if in thus giving a good example to the other autocephalous Byzantine Churches he would revive the decree of union of Florence which doubtless lies dormant somewhere in the archives of the Great Church.

Martin Jugie, A.A.

Comments and Documents

THE BISHOP OF MAINZ ON THE ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

We are printing below the major part of a Pastoral Letter which His Excellency Albert Stohr, Bishop of Mainz, addressed to his clergy on the occasion of the Octave of Pentecost, the time indicated by Leo XIII as propitious for supplications to the Holy Ghost that all separated brethren be gathered back into the unity of the true Faith. It is an exhortation to the priests of Mainz to increase their interest and redouble their efforts in favour of non-Catholics in search of unity.

Our readers may find it of unusual interest, not only because it sketches the status of the "Ecumenical Movement" just before the Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, but more particularly because it reflects a certain healthy unrest in German Protestant circles, and the unusually vigorous striving of many sincere souls toward a fuller conception of Christ's one, holy Church.

I.

Beloved brethren, we cannot help but be profoundly moved before the tremendous longing for Church unity that has come upon an untold number of Christians. The great conferences of the Ecumenical Movement of Stockholm 1925, Lausanne 1927, Edinburgh 1937, Amsterdam 1948, and Lund 1952 are indicative of this trend. These conferences were not all of the same kind. Some dealt with joint Christian action in the sphere of practical activities, and others thrust into the heart of the essential problem, setting as their goal the questions of Faith and Church Order. Both kinds of questions were dealt with by the first ecumenical assembly after the second World War that took place at Amsterdam in 1948. Almost 160 Christian communities were gathered there, who all, at one time in the past, had been glad to be given the great name of Church. There were lacking only representatives of Rome with about 400,000,000 members, and Moscow and the "Orthodox" Church on the far side of the Iron Curtain with about 150,000,000 members. An Ecumenical Council was formed there which avoided the danger of being corrupted by the pride of wishing to be a Church or super-Church, but which in brotherly love seeks and strives to progress along the way to greater unity. The tendency towards unity is even more pronounced in an organization that was created in America last year. There a true, organic reunion was sought, although clarification of the questions of faith was forsaken, and hence must be looked upon rather as a step backward. It is befitting that we look with respect upon this longing for unity in the love of Christ, and allow ourselves to be duly moved by it. And no one should outstrip us in the desire to contribute to the unity that we so often confess in the Credo of the Holy Mass. Dear brethren, this so-called Ecumenical Movement is not everywhere of equal intensity, does not everywhere place emphasis on the same things, and differs in many ways with regard to seriousness and depth; nevertheless, these are traits common to all. The development of this movement on German soil appears to be especially significant.

The National-Socialist regime had planned to put the Lutheran Church gradually out of existence, with pseudo-democratic means to sieze control through the agency of its own subservient creatures, to destroy it utterly from the point of view of belief, and restrict it to the formulas of the so-called

"German Christians," which would have been tantamount to total paganism. But the consciousness of the faith still remaining rebelled against this crime, in the knowledge that Christ is Lord of His Church, and that all power within the Church comes from Him. For centuries, under the influence of the Augsburg Confession, it had been believed that the Order of the Church was an indifferent matter; it was sufficient to maintain the faith, that is, the pure doctrine. Thus, all the Protestant ecclesiastical constitutions after the collapse of 1918 had classified Faith and Order in two distinct categories. It was only when the National-Socialist regime declared that it wished merely to change the Order, that our Protestant brethren finally became aware that Faith and Order by nature belong one to another, and that the Order of the Church, its law, is the law of Jesus Christ. (Therefore, the dogmatic section of the Ecumenical Movement is called Faith and Order.) Herein was found the starting point for a proper ecclesiastical law, *"Bekenntnisrecht"* (Confessional Law,) as it is called, as well as for the rejection of the state church institution, an institution that had already far too long enchained the true understanding of the Church. Although considered as an emergency law, left undetermined as to its origin and scope, more sensed than clearly known, it nevertheless proved very effective. The Bishop of the State, with all his followers, was swept away, excommunicated from the Evangelical Lutheran community, and this was an eminently courageous action. This action, and still more, the encyclical condemnation of the basic theses of National Socialism that followed, led hundreds of Protestant pastors to prison. It was in this way that many entered into contact with their Catholic brethren. Today we know that the glorious encyclical of Pius XI, *Mit brennender Sorge* was born in the midst of these events.

From that time, the question of ecclesiastical lawyers and of ecclesiastical law has not ceased to preoccupy Protestant circles. The office and its source, the office of Bishop, and even the office of Peter himself are today much discussed questions among our Protestant brethren. An Evangelical pastor, who was, however, suspended from office, has written a book entitled *Des Petrus Bekenntnis und Schluessel* (*Confession and Keys of Peter*) in which he all but gives a proof from Lutheran tradition that the office of Peter is necessarily inherent in the Church, and that it could not have been extinguished with the death of Peter.

Very closely united to this is the rediscovery of the sacramental concept by these brethren of ours, who had often sought to distinguish their community from our Church by calling theirs the "Church of the Word." The crucial period of the church struggle guided them back to the sources of strength, the most central of which is the Sacrament of the Last Supper. This Sacrament was placed more and more in the center of the Divine Service. An eminent churchman presented to his brethren the doctrine of the Holy Mass in the liturgical encyclical of Pius XII, *Mediator Dei.* He believed that he could say to them that the Catholic teaching on the Holy Mass was here so formulated that in it one could discern the voice of the Good Shepherd. Also auricular confession, that for so long had been among the most misunderstood teachings, has been given extraordinary attention. It has been recalled that Luther personally employed it throughout his life, and praised it highly. Special sacristies are set apart for this purpose; instructions and official directives are given, but always without clearly explaining from whence the power of absolution has come so suddenly. As is known, the

General Synod of the United Evangelical Lutheran Churches of Germany (VELKD,) which took place at Flensburg in the last week of April, declared that it was the duty of the pastors to hear confessions. Such confessions can of course not be a Sacrament as we understand it.

Even Mary finds consideration and esteem. In spite of the loud opposition to the Marian dogma of All Saints Day in 1950, certain Marian traces are being discovered in early Protestantism, and there has even been discovered an extremely tender explanation of the *Magnificat* from Luther's own pen.

The head of a north German *Landeskirche,* who spoke here at Mainz a year ago, has arrived at really amazing concepts. He admits grave dangers in the severe Reformation formula, "Scripture alone, Faith alone, only through grace," and to avoid the too one-sided limitations he asks that the Catholic additions be made: "Scripture and Tradition, Faith and Works, grace and worthiness," (as he prefers to say instead of *merit.*) Indeed, he develops this concept to the point of making it a maxim, and deplores that Protestants in their unilateral desire of giving honour to God and to Jesus Christ have lost many precious things, to the detriment of religious vitality and health: the angels and the saints, that is, the followers of Christ; office, possible only with the authorization of Christ; and the whole sacramental world—above all the Sacrament of the Altar, that fills the present with divine life and the nearness of God, and preserves it from becoming empty.

Thus, we no longer wonder at the fact that in the preparations for the Conference of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam, in the official material for the first section, one finds the treatise of an Anglican Archbishop (Gregg) which discusses the theme of the Church in an almost entirely Catholic sense. He calls the Church the Spouse of Christ, the Body of Christ, the branches of the divine vine of Christ, the flock of the Good Shepherd. Then the author deals with the four marks of the Church so familiar to us: one, holy, catholic, and apostolic. As obligations and duties of the Church, he enumerates, 1) Confession of divinely revealed truth; 2) Celebration of the Divine Service; 3) Education of Christians for the just life as children of God.

These things correspond to the three-fold office of the Church, the office of the teacher, of the priest, and of the shepherd. There are only a very few phrases in the whole work to which I would have to object. Among these is especially the indirect blow against the temporal power of the Church contained in his rejection of pacts and concordats—evidently a remainder of misunderstandings not yet overcome. This treatise is all the more important for the reason that it does not merely express the opinion of one outstanding ecclesiastic, but rather represents the usual Anglican doctrine.

Indeed, they find themselves obliged to accept an ecclesiastical teaching authority. During the bitter struggle of the Church heresies had to be condemned and their proponents expelled from the ecclesiastical community. Likewise, in very recent times procedures for the discipline of teaching have been established, and this in a community which for centuries had honoured individual conscience as the final rule of conduct. But now, the General Synod of Flensburg has charged the Bishops of the *Landeskirche* to make a doctrinal decision against Bultmann's *Entymythologisierung* of the New Testament.

II.

Beloved brethren, with this we must close our very sketchy survey, and may I ask you: are these not signs of a new epoch? Certainly, we should not nourish false hopes. We are still far from the goal, and the new understanding has not become the possession of all. Its leaders are still individual pioneers, or at best front-line groups. Nevertheless, the time has passed when the bitter words that, even in recent times, came to our ears from the other side of the barrier should be deemed as the destruction of all our hopes.

Also in that which regards understanding among themselves, all the gaps are by no means filled. There still remain a thousand questions between individuals and between groups in the Protestant camp; for example, they have not yet arrived at any real union in Divine Service, and especially in the Last Supper. Precisely in the Center of Christian worship, namely, in the carrying out of our Lord's command in the celebration of the Supper in His memory, Protestants feel painfully the differences between themselves, and their inability to know themselves one in the Lord. This was felt most acutely on the occasion of the great world conferences of Stockholm and Amsterdam. Also, for the conference of Lund no way has been found for a Communion that would unite all the Christians gathered together there.

There is still no unity in the concept of the ministry. At the last world conference, it became apparent that the most grievous cleavage was that which separated the so-called "Catholic" and the so-called "Protestant" groups. The "Catholic" groups say that the power of the ministry should be transmitted from the first encumbents to their successors by the laying on of hands, and in this wise give the utmost importance to uninterrupted apostolic succession. The "Protestant" groups are of the opinion that the power of the ministry lies in the midst of the universal Church, and that the force of the Holy Ghost springs forth as from a fountain in individuals particularly endowed with grace, according to a concept totally foreign to the Christianity of the first thousand years. They thus compel the Anglicans, and universal Christendom, to ask with us the question: Brethren, what foundations have you for this? How can you build a Church upon such a thing? Where do you find powers to absolve, consecrate, ordain? We ask this especially since many of your communities have deliberately broken away from traditional, ancient Christian consecrations.

Neither is there unity in faith. It is true that Amsterdam admitted to the Ecumenical Council only those Christians who confessed Jesus Christ as God and Saviour, but very soon it was found that this constituted a difficulty for a number of those that had been admitted. The National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States replaced the formula with the much less precise term, Christ as *Divine Lord and Saviour*. Herein lies one of the most difficult points for the unity movement. The loyalty that we Catholics take for granted to the clear formulas of faith inherited from the Christian past, is in large measure shared by the "Orthodox," and permeates Anglicanism as it does the more rigorous Lutheranism, but those orientated upon the Reformation idea are much less disposed to hold that one must not deviate by "one jot or one tittle" (Mt. 5:18) from that which the Holy Ghost has bestowed once and for all upon His Church as valid confession of faith. The Anglican Bishop Charles Brent, President of the Lausanne Con-

ference (1927) had incisively formulated the Catholic standpoint on this matter: "Truth is greater than unity. If possible, truth with unity, but truth at all cost and without unity, if this must be."

The least unity of all is to be found in the concept of the Church. Here it should be taken into consideration that the consciousness of the Church has had to be reawakened in the last fifty years. Each little community of Christians claimed the right, at least up to very recently, to call itself *church,* while actually there exists only one Church of Jesus Christ, and we Roman Catholics who hold strongly and firmly to the faith inherited from the Fathers, we are this one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church, of which the confession of faith deriving from the earliest times . . . and bearing the name of the most venerable Greek Father of the Church, Athanasius, says: "This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe faithfully and steadfastly, he cannot be saved."

III.

Beloved brethren, I have spoken to you about manifestations that have occurred among our brethren, and that in our ranks are still too little known. Here and there some one or another of our faithful, learning of these developments among the Protestants, arrives at the quite erroneous conclusion: So, now the differences between confessions are no longer such an important matter. You priests will not misunderstand me in this wise. I must not, and I do not wish to have diminished in any one of the faithful the certainty of his belief, the fervor of his faith, and his loyalty to the faith, not even in the slightest degree. On the contrary: "The bond of my baptism must ever remain firm. I will hear the Church." This conviction remains undiminished, strengthened, rather. We should rejoice that on the other side of the barrier, men are being urged on by the Holy Ghost from one position to another, and that many find themselves immediately faced by the question: "Why, after all, does separation from the Catholic Church still exist?" Evidently, God is at work, binding together the rifts that divide Christendom. The efforts made from Stockholm to Lund are in many ways very incomplete and fragmentary, but still they are always a deeply moving expression of a truly pious and truly Christian longing toward the achievement of Christ the High Priest's prayer "that all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (Jo. 17:21.) Reverend brethren, let us pray that these words of Our Lord may be fulfilled, and if possible in our days! Let us pray ceaselessly. Let us follow the "Ecumenical Movement" with the greatest possible interest. . . . The ecumenical question is certainly one of the most urgent duties that has been imposed by God upon our times. For this we must muster all our spiritual vigilance, and all our love. Yes, we must love boundlessly, in a truly apostolic, catholic way, that is with all-encompassing breadth.

St. Paul, in the Epistle to the Ephesians, which contains so much on the mystery of the Church, employs the phrase: "Rather are we to practice the truth in love." (Eph. 4:15) Perhaps it is love that prepares the way to truth and to Christian unity. Pius XI says, "More than through discussion, unity progresses through the works of love. They banish distrust and purify the affections, sometimes a more difficult thing than to purify the thoughts." (AAS 1923 S. 579.) I would like to bring your attention to the fact that

the priest is an exponent of the Church in a much higher degree for those who are seeking and asking, than, as is readily to be understood, he is for the Catholics who are already ours. Hence, our duty to the former is doubly grave, and has a redoubled significance. Let us then put on Christ, the all-embracing Christ, and therewith show to the seeking brother what the truth and grace of Christ are. This very grace will make us able if we give ourselves over to it without reserve. My dear brethren, I have desired greatly to address these words to you who, working indefatigably in the service of the chief shepherd and guardian of our souls (I Pet. 2:25,) will without doubt hear in them the voice of the Good Shepherd, who has a paternal interest in all the baptized, over whom has been invoked the name of the same Holy Trinity that has been invoked upon ourselves. Herein resounds the call of your Bishop who has been placed "to rule the Church of God, which He has purchased with His own Blood." (Acts 20:28.) These are the calls of a Bishop who has had the occasion to approach and look deeply into the hearts of many Protestants, and who has been profoundly impressed by their religious earnestness and by the sincerity of their searching.

It caused me great sorrow to learn that a worthy Lutheran ecclesiastic, who in the last ten years has done much to eliminate misunderstandings, said in his words of farewell from official duties, "There is nothing in the world that impedes the unity of the Christian Church in such a painful way as the Roman Catholic Church's claim that she, and only she, is the one and true Church, and that therefore no partial church, nor the whole of the so-called 'churches' have any right to call themselves Catholic as the Church of Rome does." Has the author not discovered among his Anglican friends how anxious they are that the door to Rome be not closed? Unfortunately, it would seem that even among well disposed men Dr. Staehlin is not alone in holding this opinion. Indeed, the Anglican Secretary General of the World Conference on Faith and Order, with the grave attitude of the American free churches in mind, and despite all his reverences to Rome, believes that he must now declare as a summary of ecumenical opinion, "...we are clearly united in not accepting the form of unity which she (Rome) offers." (*Ecumenical Review*, April, 1952.) And this statement was published at the time when Dean Asmussen was resigning from his ecumenical offices because of his conviction that the Ecumenical Movement (in Germany) through its President Niemoeller, is becoming blind with regard to Communism. It was a moment when, in another part, the Anglican Archbishop of York, Dr. Garbett, was calling the public's attention to the fact that beyond the Iron Curtain the Catholic Church alone is persecuted, and that only she has martyrs. He means that this should give pause for thought, and we are certainly of the same mind.

Thus it can be understood why some of our separated brethren are ever more constrained to acknowledge that unity has been saved in the Roman Church; in her the faith has been saved, even through the darkest centuries; in her the ancient Creed has been saved, and has been in uninterrupted use in her prayers and hymns; the Church of Rome has saved the ancient Sacraments and has not acceded to any criticism; she has maintained ecclesiastical Orders in uninterrupted succession through all the centuries from generation to generation; in her shines, down through the ages, as from a lofty light-house, the truth of the words of St. Ambrose: "Where Peter is, there is the Church; where the Church is, there death is not, but eternal

life." (in Psalm 40 n, Rouet 12, 61.) This Church strives today to speak to our modern times in a form that corresponds to the expectation of the best among our Christian brethren, with ever renewed forces, and with expressions that on the one hand do not renounce in any point the clear Catholic truth, and on the other hand, prepare ever better responses to the questions and the nostalgic appeals of our brethren who approach Christian Revelation from a world quite different from our own. In this connection, the progress of our theological work, and also the enrichment of our preaching and catechism with the best modern theology acquire a quite new significance, and become a cogent obligation. (cf. K. Rahner in Schlier, *Einheit der Kirche, Hochland,* April, 1952.)

Suggestions of a Dutch Lutheran on Evangelical "Catholicity"

The small minority group of Lutherans in Holland have shown signs of inner activity in recent years. They have taken into account their rather isolated position, and have been considering the means of strengthening it. Proposals of reunion offered by the Calvinistic Dutch Reformed Church have been entertained, but with reticence; the Lutheran group feels obliged to preserve its own particular witness. A recent article by J. F. Bianchi of Breukelen, entitled *Toward an Evangelical Catholicity,* and published in the Dutch *Evangelical Lutheran Weekly,* discusses relations based upon "Catholic" sympathies which might be fostered between the Dutch Lutherans, the Old Catholic Church, the Swedish Lutheran Church, and the Hilversum Convent ("Catholicizing" group within the Dutch Reformed Church; cf. *Comments and Documents,* UNITAS, Vol. IV, No. 2.)

The author is of the opinion that the Dutch Lutherans should not seek rapprochement with the Dutch Reformed Church, as has been considered by some who would see in such an amalgamation the creation of "one Church of the Reformation." He is of the opinion that they, in company with other Lutheran groups, should rather draw the Reformation inheritance into "Evangelical Catholicity."

He says, "It would be much more important to direct conversations toward the non-Roman, Catholic Churches. We ought to have the spiritual courage to turn to these Churches and to seek contact over fundamental theological problems."[1]

He sees three possibilities of Dutch Lutherans entering into contact with what he calls "Evangelical Catholicity:" a) In ecumenical union, to seek a closer contact with the Old Catholic Church, officially and personally; b) To seek personal contacts with the Hilversum Convent; c) In union with the Lutheran World Federation, to seek a closer contact with the Swedish Lutheran Church.

He continues, "Contact with the Old Catholic Church is so important because this Church has intercommunion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion. This intercommunion signifies that the Old Catholic Church has full eucharistic and pulpit fellowship with the Anglican Churches; but both recognize each other as separate communions. Moreover, the Old Catholic Church is trying to achieve intercommunion with the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and recently also with the Swedish Church. The Hilversum Convent is a centre for discussion with (non-Roman) Catholic-minded Christians. Questions respecting Catholic beliefs are worthily discussed at con-

[1]) Citations are taken from the translation printed in the *Church Times,* July 4, 1952.

ferences and meetings. By these, our own Reformation insights can be tested against Catholic ones. The Lutheran Church of Sweden has also a limited intercommunion with the Anglican Churches, and full intercommunion with other Lutheran Churches."

The writer is of the opinion that in Protestantism too little emphasis is laid on the Incarnation of the Word of God, and its significance. He feels that the problem of Christ dwelling among us in relation with the Church as the Body of Christ should be studied. Emphasis is placed on the need among Dutch Lutherans for taking seriously the great Creeds. It is of interest that he as a Lutheran should bring up the problem of sacrifice and orders. He says, "Extremely important points for discussion should be the ideas of sacrifice in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. This is completely foreign to us today; but, through the latest theological exegesis, a modification is here possible—see Professor Van der Leeuw's Sacramental-theology—and the doctrine of the so-called 'Historical episcopate' (the apostolical succession.)' He is of the opinion that the Swedish Lutheran Church, alone among the Lutheran group, has maintained apostolic succession. "But," he says, "it does not attach so much importance to it as the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches."

On the problem of one Church of Christ, the author says that it is already one in essence, but that it must be brought to embrace all variations of Christians. It would seem, though, that he has not as yet probed the full import of this conviction, since he himself follows the line of exclusion at the outset when he turns away from his closest neighbours, the Dutch Reformed community. Indeed, if all variations should be embraced by Christ's Church, why should he propose the study of doctrines that his own community does not *hic et nunc* represent?

It is to be surmised that the author has not yet been obliged to plunge into all that the weighty problem of valid, uninterrupted apostolic succession entails, and has not yet been brought face to face with the grave difference existing between mere belief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and the actual possession of it. Whatever his present ideas, and whatever the form that his initiatives may now assume, his article stands as further evidence of a sincere search within the Protestant world for a fuller conception of the faith, and of an advance toward, rather than a retreat from that indestructible unity willed by Christ in the one Church which He established once for all time.

Salvatore Butler, S.A.

NEWS

ECUMENISM AND REUNION

Faith and Order Conference at Lund

The *Faith and Order Commission* of the World Council of Churches is holding a world conference at Lund, Sweden, from August 15 to 29. We hope to bring news of this important assembly in our next issue. About 250 delegates representing millions of Christians are expected. The Patriarch of Moscow will not be represented, nor any of the dissident churches depending upon his patriarchate. The Catholic hierarchy has appointed three observers to the conference; all of them have been chosen from Sweden. These are Msgr. David Assarson, Fr. de Pailleret, O.P. and Fr. Gerlach, S.J.

The central problem to be studied is the nature of the Church. This is a crucial problem involving the necessity of a hierarchy, Apostolic Order, Tradition as well as Sacred Scripture as source of Revelation, and extends even to the Sacraments. Forms of worship, with the necessity of liturgical prayer, are also to be discussed.

A number of interesting reports and studies, serving excellently to clarify the various attitudes on the central problems to be dealt with have been published as preparatory material for the conference. We point out: *The Ecumenical Review* for April 1952, which contains a series of pertinent articles. Three reports: *The Church,* (chairman, R. Newton Flew; Secretary, Kenneth Riches, 3s 6d;) *Intercommunion* (chairman, Donald Baille; secretary, John Marsh, 2s;) *Ways of Worship* (chairman, G. van der Leeuw; secretary, Wiebe Vos, 2s;) *Intercommunion,* edited by Donald Baillie and John Marsh, 21s; *The Nature of the Church,* edited by R. Newton Flew, 21s; *Ways of Worship,* edited by Pehr Edwall, Eric Hayman, and William D. Maxwell, 21s. The reports and books are published by the SCM Press.

Dr. Van Dusen on "Faith and Order"

A four-day seminar on *The Theological Roots of Ecumenical Protestantism* was held recently at Lake Geneva. President Henry Pitney Van Dusen of Union Seminary gave a discourse in which he repudiated "any idea of Christian unity which is concerned only with ignoring differences." He advised the state and local council secretaries that they deceived themselves "if they thought the type of unity which is satisfied with carrying on projects together and assuring each other that they possess 'spiritual unity' was the final answer to the Prayer of the Lord that His followers 'may all be one.'"

According to him real Christian unity requires recognition of each other's ministries, and intercommunion as members of the one Church of Christ. Requisites are agreement in matters of faith, worship, the sacraments, polity and orders. He remarked that although it is often supposed that questions of faith separate the various confessions, there exists essential agreement in doctrine of God, man, the world, revelation, salvation, redemption and eternal life, among non-Roman Christians according to statements of the Lausanne and Edinburgh Conferences on Faith and Order.

He added: "There is often a far greater degree of theological divergence between extremes of thought within one Church than between one denomination and another. . . . Historic and cultural factors, temperamental differences

and differences in our interpretation of Christian ethics more effectively divide the Church than does essential theology."

With regard to worship, it was his opinion that for the greater part the crucial differences involve sacraments and ordination. Serious problems about sacraments have to do with validity of administration by various "orders." Thus the problem of ordination and apostolic succession becomes the most important difference to be reconciled for the achievement of true unity.

He advanced the idea that in the early Church, three principles of Chuch authority were recognized: episcopal, presbyterian, and congregational. Modern "ecumenical" conferences prior to Amsterdam had recognized all three principles, and all major denominations held to at least one of these. He spoke of the adoption of the "principle of comprehension" in the South India Church Union. But he would advocate mutual recognition of the full and *equal* validity of the main types. He said, "It is my suggestion that a sound procedure would be a common recognition that: all three forms obtained in the early Church and must therefore be present in the true Church; all three major traditions departed from full order of the true Church in their omission of one or more forms, and are currently therefore incomplete; for recovery of full orders, each must avail itself of the true elements; to that end an appropriate rite by which each is admitted to the tradition which it does not now possess should mark entrance by each into the full ministry of the Church of Christ. This is the procedure sometimes called the 'extension of orders.'"

In his search for a solution of apostolic order, Dr. Van Dusen does not seem to have considered sufficiently the indefectibility of the Church that must necessarily persevere in the visible, true Church of Christ, and which would certainly have been shattered if anything as essential as full apostolic order had at any time been lacking from it. Nevertheless, the search for valid apostolic orders would represent a notable advance for many Protestant bodies who have traditionally been satisfied with a non-episcopal system.

W.C.C. Library

A library on the "ecumenical movement" and activities of the World Council of Churches exists at the headquarters of the World Council at 17 route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland. It was established there in 1945. From a few hundred books it has grown to a collection of about 7,500 volumes. It has the aim of providing the most thorough documentation possible concerning the ecumenical movement for the most widely varying readers. It has sections on "ecumenism" (i.e., inter-church relations,) Church history in its ecumenical aspects, on reunion movements past and present, on irenicism, ecclesiology and like subjects. It receives about 160 theological and religious reviews and periodicals from all over the world. The library also possesses a bookshop of its own, where all publications of the World Council may be obtained on application to the librarian, Mlle. Helene Leckie. (EPS)

"Ecumenical" Week-end

In recent months an inter-confessional *"Week-end of Christian Unity"* took place at the Anglican St. John's Wood Chapel, London. Representatives

of Catholic, "Orthodox," Swedish, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational bodies joined with the Anglicans for the occasion.

Rev. Oliver Tomkins (Associate General Secretary of the W.C.C.) presided at the gathering. The speakers described the confessions of which they are members and their relations with other Christian bodies.

Hilversum Convent Holds Inter-Confessional Meeting

The *Hilversum Convent*, a group of ministers and laypeople of the Dutch Reformed Church seeking to restore apostolic ministry within their own communion, held an inter-confessional gathering near Hilversum in May. Dr. Loos, leader of the *Hilversum* movement, presided. There were present three Anglicans, four German Lutherans of Prof. Heiler's group, and four members of the Calvinistic religious Community of Taizé-les-Cluny, besides some 150 people assisting, among whom were Lutherans, Calvinists and Old Catholics.

Dr. Loos in a discourse spoke of the Anglicans as being truly "Re-formed" in the restoration of Catholic faith and worship. Brother Roger of the Taizé Community defended the religious community life, with its celibacy and community of goods. Dr. Drobnitzy (Lutheran) spoke on "Evangelical Catholicity in the light of the Ascension of Jesus Christ." He considered this under the headings of Biblical learning, Sacramental Life, Apostolic Order, and Ecumenical Unity. In each case he pointed out the shortcomings of liberal, traditional, and pietistic Protestantism. Mr. Fitch (Anglican) spoke on "The Religious Life in the Catholic Church and its revival in the Anglican Communion." The Dutch people present listened with great interest to this account of "Catholic" revival, and took special note of the idea that the religious is the Puritan within the Catholic Church without being in schism with it, as it was described by the Anglican religious speaker. Dr. Van Linde of the Hague spoke on "Ecumenism and Catholicity." He found that the World Council of Churches was ecumenical without being Catholic, although the two terms should have identical significance. He recognized dangers in the Anglican lack of doctrinal authority, however it might avoid evils of coercion.

An Anglican Eucharistic service was celebrated at which the Old Catholics communicated. The Reformed members communicated at the Lutheran *Abendmahl.*

It became apparent in this conference that the Hilversum "Catholicizing" movement is exercising considerable influence, especially among the young. Chief emphasis is placed on Apostolic Succession, in the belief that there can be no Sacramental revival in the Dutch Reformed Church until a valid ministry is established. The Germans were in agreement upon the principle, but prefer to obtain this Succession privately through one of the *Episcopi Vagantes.*[1] The Taizé members disagreed with this policy. (*Church Times*)

Methodist Attitude on Anglican Reunion Proposals

At a Methodist Conference at Preston (England) in early July, Dr. Harold Roberts, convenor of the Methodist Committee on Church relations, gave the views of his committee on the proposals of reunion drawn up by the Archbishop of Canterbury. According to the proposals, no intercommunion

[1]) *Episcopus Vagans*—one who may have valid consecration, but who does not have jurisdiction nor regular canonical status.

could be possible without a universally recognized ministry. Hence, the crucial issue becomes the episcopacy. As Methodists, Dr. Roberts reports, they may not take the view, as interpreted by many Anglican churchmen, that episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church. They had, nevertheless, tried to understand why episcopacy was considered to be of such great importance.

A further difficulty would be in any obligation of separation from non-episcopal bodies with which they now have communion, so as to gain inter-communion with the Church of England.

Moreover, the speaker remarked, it was no use talking about unity or the peace of the Church of Christ, if at the holy table, "the churches went their different ways." He affirmed, however, that if there was a common desire to seek unity, in the will of God, they could go forward, keeping every door open. If they could not find a way, God would.

In any case, as had been established by the Archbishop of Canterbury, no final decision on the Report could be made until the Church of England had spoken. The Methodists were satisfied with this condition, since they wished to know what the Church of England had to say on the matter in an authoritative way. (*Church Times*)

Exposition of Catholicism to Interdenominational Group at Rome

A number of lectures on Roman Catholicism were arranged for the year 1952 by the Methodist Youth of Rome under the auspices of the local Interdenominational Youth Committee. The lectures formed part of a series of ecumenical studies begun last year with a survey of Protestantism. This year lectures of an informative scope were given by Catholic speakers in the Methodist Hall in Rome. Dr. C. Graziani, Central delegate to the Italian Catholic Action Youth spoke on "The Catholic Church: Organization and Inner Structure;" Prof. C. Carretto, President of the Italian Catholic Action Youth spoke on "The Soul of the Liturgy;" Prof. L. Gedda, President-General of Italian Catholic Action, spoke on "Faith and Science Today;" Prof. M. Lacalamita, Central delegate to the Italian Catholic Action Youth for Social Activities spoke on "The Catholic Church: Authority and Liberty." Although this activity is limited in extent, it would indicate the awakening of an irenic approach to the Catholic Church among Protestants of Italy. (EPS)

History of the Ecumenical Movement

The complete text in first draft of the *History of the Ecumenical Movement* has almost reached completion. The work is being prepared under the auspices of the World Council. For more than five years an international group of 16 scholars has been working on the preparation of the History. It will appear in two volumes of about a thousand pages. It is unlikely that the compiled work will appear before the middle of 1954. It will be published first in English, to be followed, it is hoped, by French and German versions. (EPS)

The "Catholica Unio"

The *Catholica Unio* suffered a serious-set back in consequence of the last war. At the present time it is being built up again, and promises a flourishing future. This is an association that has the purpose of furthering Christian unity with special reference to the Eastern Churches; it nurtures

sacerdotal vocations and maintains seminaries of Oriental rite, and seeks to arouse prayers and support publications to this end. (Cf. C. Korolevskij, UNITAS, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 133, 134.)

Since the war the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church has given the association a new impulse. The General Secretariate of Switzerland was reorganized, and efforts have been made to establish this institution in countries of South America and Europe where formerly it had not existed. Since 1946, Bishop Francis Charrière of Fribourg, who succeded Bishop Besson, has been President General. According to recent reports we may give the following news on the *Catholica Unio* as of 1951.

In Germany the results have been very satisfying. The National President is Bishop Landersdorfer of Passau, and the National Secretary is Fr. Alphonse M. Mitnacht of the Hermits of St. Augustine, who are propagating this movement.

In Berlin and Western Germany there are about 40,000 members, of whom 3,500 are ecclesiastics. About 5,000 are children under 15 years who form the *Crusade for Church Unity*. About 1,500 members take part in the *Apostolate of the Holy Mass,* whereby they assist once a week at Mass to supplicate the return of separated Orientals. 40 Congregations and Religious Communities, comprising 28,000 persons, participate in the association as members of the *Crusade of Prayer*.

On behalf of the association, Fr. Mitnacht has given many sermons and lectures, and has offered numerous celebrations of the Divine Liturgy in the Byzantine rite throughout Germany, frequently taking part in the observation of Oriental Days.

Der Christliche Osten, a bi-monthly publication printed in 4,000 copies, makes known the problems of the Orient. Knowledge of the Orient is also furthered by the *University Institute for the Knowledge of the Christian Orient*, for which there is a chair at the University of Wurzburg. It was founded by Prof. Wunderle and has recently been reestablished through the efforts of Bishop Charrière and Dr. Hundhammer, Minister of Public Worship at Munich. This institution publishes the review, *Ostkirchliche Studien*.

In Austria the national president of the *Catholica Unio* is Archbishop Rohracher of Salzburg. After the death of Rev. Joseph Casper, a learned priest of the Byzantine rite who had been the chief promoter of the movement, the National Secretariate was confided to the Monastery of St. Peter at Salzburg. It is expected that the liturgical review of this Monastery will give space to the purposes of the association.

In Argentina the Benedictines of the Argentine Congregation in a General Chapter gave formal assurance that the Monks would undertake a zealous propagation of the *Catholica Unio*. Dom Tarcisio Germaniez is National Secretary, and is assisted by Dom Segundo Benito of Buenos Aires. Considerable interest in the problems of the Oriental Church has been manifested in various Major Seminaries.

In Brazil the *Catholica Unio* flourishes. It is directed by Fr. Pedro Roeser, National President, with the assistance of Mauro Bodenmueller, Secretary. They are now at work on a project for the foundation of a circle of *Oblates of Union*. The plan is to organize girls, especially of the Oriental rite and educate them especially for the apostolate of the association.

The work of the *Catholica Unio* is widespread in Switzerland, and has been intensified in all ways. A great number of lectures have been given in

parishes, Major Seminaries, and colleges. At the present time a plan of organization upon parochial or regional bases is being studied. Fruitful relations have been formed with other organizations interested in the return of the separated Orientals. A very readable and attractive quarterly review entitled *Catholica Unio* is published at Fribourg. Rev. Conrad Fischer, the General Secretary, is editor. (SICO)

* * * *

Around the World

ROME

American Slovaks Offer Altar to St. Cyril

During the Holy year Mr. Michael Sincak, an American originally from Slovakia, came to Rome on pilgrimage. Noting the lack of an altar to St. Cyril, the great Apostle of the Slavs, in the crypt of the Basilica of St. Clement where his sacred relics are entombed, Mr. Sincak undertook to provide for the erection of such an altar, and raised funds for this purpose among the Slovaks of America. A group of American Slovak pilgrims led by Mr. Sincak, on pilgrimage to Rome after having taken part in the Eucharistic Congress of Barcelona, were present at the inaugural Mass of the new altar.

A Divine Liturgy was celebrated for this occasion under the auspices of the Unitas *Association*. Archbishop Evreinoff was celebrant; Fr. Cancio and Fr. Krajnik were concelebrants; music was executed by the choir of the Russicum college. The Liturgy was commenced in the chapel of St. Cyril and St. Methodius in the upper church. After the singing of the Gospel, celebrants and ministers, followed by the faithful, went in solemn procession to the crypt and the ceremonies continued at the new altar.

A sermon was delivered by Fr. Lacko of the Oriental Institute. He recalled that St. Cyril and St. Methodius had given the Slavs their own writing, along with their own literature with the translation of sacred books, and had introduced the national language into the Sacred Liturgy. He also referred to the work of Bishop Anthony Martin Slomsek who had carried on the spirit of the great apostles to the Slavs. In 1851 he had founded the *Confraternity of St. Cyril and St. Methodius* with the scope of bringing back the Oriental dissidents to the true Church. This Confraternity later became the *Apostolate of St. Cyril and St. Methodius under the protection of the Most Holy Virgin Mary.*

A reception was given in honour of the American Slovak pilgrims later in the day at the Unitas *Foyer.*

* * * *

HOLLAND

25th Anniversary of the Apostlaat der Hereniging

The *Apostolaat der Hereniging* (Apostolate of Reunion,) a Dutch society whose scope comprises promotion of the cause of reunion with regard to separated Christians of both Orient and Occident, is celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. (cf. C. Korolevskij, *The Dutch Apostolaat der Hereniging*, Unitas, Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 133, 136.)

An extensive campaign for propagation of the society has been carried

out; special religious functions and prayers for reunion of all separated Christians were organized. The high point in the campaign was a week of celebration from June 29 to July 8 in which His Eminence Eugene Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, took part.

His Eminence was welcomed with great honour and celebration in Holland. Towns and villages along his route through Brabant were decorated as for a triumphant king. He was received by Her Majesty the Queen, who manifested great interest in explanations of the Oriental Church and the plight of Christians behind the Iron Curtain.

The Cardinal's message to the Catholics of Holland was broadcast from the Catholic radio station KRO on July 8. He thanked them for what they had done for the Oriental Church since the founding of the *Apostolaat* in 1927, and exhorted them to continue with redoubled zeal since the needs of the Oriental Church are now a hundred times greater. In many nations where the Catholic peoples are of Byzantine rite the Church is undergoing the greatest persecution of her history. His Eminence then lauded the perseverance of the Oriental Catholics, both the hierarchy and faithful in holding fast to their unity with the Holy See in spite of the terrible campaign launched against them with the purpose of destroying their Catholic spirit. He exhorted the Dutch Catholics to pray for their brethren in their time of trial, and thus fortify themselves against possible future trials.

Cardinal Tisserant then praised Dutch Catholics for what they had accomplished in defense of the faith. They have received hundreds of Russian and Ukrainian refugees for whom they have erected centres with Oriental chapels in Amsterdam and The Hague. For a number of years they had maintained a seminary for Ukrainians at Culemborg.

Other Oriental institutions are still helped through the contributions of the *Apostolaat der Hereniging* such as the Greek College at Rome, seminaries and schools in Turkey, Greece, Lebanon, Syria, Mesopotamia, Jordania, and Palestine. The Dutch Commission "Pro Palestina," under the auspices of the *Apostolaat* and with the encouragement of the Bishops is giving generous aid to the Catholics in the Land of Jesus.

All these things give reasons for thanksgiving in the Jubilee Year, but even so the purposes of the *Apostolaat* are not fulfilled; they are reasons rather for redoubling efforts in favor of Oriental Christians. He recommended besides prayers, and besides material assistance, that the faithful strive to increase in knowledge of the Orient. As knowledge of the Orient increases, so does Christian love for the separated brethren.

A Pontifical Divine Liturgy in the Byzantine rite was celebrated at the Cathedral of Utrecht by Bishop Bucko, Apostolic Visitor of Ukrainians in Western Europe, with a number of personages of the Oriental Church concelebrating. The music was rendered by the Utrecht Byzantine choir under the direction of Dr. M. Antonowytsij. This Liturgy was broadcast by the KRO.

A reception followed at which Bishop B.J. Alfrink, Coadjutor of Utrecht, thanked the *Apostolaat,* and observed that because of their zeal for the Orient, the life of the faith was strengthened at home.

The Cardinal announced that the Holy Father had named Fr. A.G. Smit, Pastor of Soestdjik, President of the *Apostolaat,* as Chamberlain to His Holiness. Fr. F. Wijnhoven, A.A., the Secretary, was awarded the decoration of *"Pro Ecclesia et Pontefice."* His Eminence made the comment that he had

become familiar with the Oriental Apostolate when a child because the Bulletin of the *Oeuvre d'Orient* was read in his home.

At the University of Nimeguen, the Doctorate in Theology, "honoris causa" was conferred upon His Eminence. On his part, he gave to the Scientific Library of the Apostolate as a gift, copies of all liturgical works in oriental languages that had been published first by the *Propaganda Fide* and later by the Oriental Congregation.

* * * *

ENGLAND

Catholic Truth Society

His Eminence Cardinal Griffin recently made an appeal for greater support of the Catholic Truth Society. It is a national organization which specializes in disseminating truths of the Catholic religion through pamphlets and other publications. This Society now has an enrollment of 19,696 active members; last year it distributed nearly 2,000,000 pamphlets.

Besides the Catholic Truth Society there are other major organizations interested in the conversion movement, such as the Catholic Missionary Society and Our Lady's Cathechists, a group of lay people directed by Jesuit priests. The Director of the Catholic Missionary Society is the Very Rev. George P. Dwyer. He urges that more be done to raise the present annual rate of 10,000 conversions to Catholicism in Britain. This Society concentrates its active work on villages scattered throughout the country, especially in five dioceses: Brentwood, Northampton, Nottingham, Menevia, and Southwark, all of which have large rural populations. Priests belonging to the Society are especially chosen by their Bishops and spend their lives roaming through the isolated rural communities, often by automobile and trailer.

Anglican Church Used as Dissident Serbian Cathedral

A dedication service of the new dissident Serbian Cathedral of St. Sava at London was celebrated on the last Sunday of June. The Cathedral was formerly St. Columb's church, Notting Hill. It has been lent to the dissident Serbians free of cost for a preliminary period of 21 years by the Anglican diocese of London.

The dedication ceremony was celebrated by Bishop Nicolai Velimirovic, head of the dissident Serbian Church in America, who had flown to England for the ceremony. Besides the dissident Oriental Bishops assisting, representatives of the Archbishop of London and Canterbury were present. About 3,000 members of the separated Serbian Church now living in England had come to join King Peter and other prominent Jugoslavs in a day of thanksgiving.

* * * *

UNITED STATES

Ground Broken for Ukrainian Church

In June the ceremony for breaking ground for a Ukrainian Byzantine-rite Catholic Church was celebrated at Jamaica Plain, near Boston. Archbishop Richard J. Cushing of Boston presided at the ceremonies, and was assisted by the Rev. Gregory H. Tom who had been sent there six years

ago by Bishop Constantine Bohachevsky, Exarch of Ukrainian Greek Rite Catholics in the United States, to found a Parish.

During the six years, in which he celebrated the Divine Liturgy in Latin churches of the region, Father Tom beginning with 12 parishioners, has built up a parish of 450. Father Tom and his parishioners raised the sum of $20,000 as a building fund; it was increased by a donation of an equal amount made by Archbishop Cushing. (NC)

Dedication of Ukrainian Catholic Seminary

A new Seminary of St. Josaphat for Ukrainian Catholics of Byzantine rite at Washington, D.C., was dedicated in May. His Excellency Archbishop Amleto Giovanni Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, officiated. He was assisted by Bishop Ambrose Senyshin, Auxiliary of the Ukrainian Catholic Exarchate of the U.S.A., Bishop Neil Savaryn, Ordinary for Ukrainian Catholics of Western Canada, Bishop Andrew Roborecki of Sasketchewan, Canada, and Bishop Maxim Hermaniuk, Auxiliary of Manitoba, Canada.

In a sermon delivered at the Divine Liturgy following the dedication, the Apostolic Delegate remarked that through the common rite shared by the Ukrainians and separated Orientals the latter would find the way open for return to unity. Therefore, he added, "by the jealous observance of your rite, you are the apostles who can most efficaciously bring to realization the prayer of Christ that there may be 'one fold and one shepherd.'" He emphasized the importance of preserving Oriental rites: "the Sovereign Pontiffs founded especially in Rome Institutes and Seminaries; a Sacred Congregation is attentive to their protection and occupies itself especially with the respective liturgical books. The soul of peoples thrills in these rites with the most profound feelings; as peoples cannot be destroyed, so neither can these sacred rites. It is for such reasons that the Holy See does not permit the passage from one rite to another without serious and cogent reasons."

"What great joy it is," His Excellency said, "to find ourselves together under the protection of the same Mother, the *Theotokos*, invoking the same saints, participating in the same Sacraments! How happy we are to assist at this Divine Liturgy, to adore together the Eucharistic Bread, and to repeat with one heart with St. Augustine, 'O Sacrament of Piety! O symbol of unity! O bow of charity!' . . . Oh, how we wish that in union with us there might be those almost 200,000,000 Christians whom unhappy circumstances separate from this unity! For centuries the binomial 'Rome and Orient' have been used as if they were antagonistic terms. Yet in the early history of the Church, Rome and the East figured as two great forces of Christianity and Apostolic centers."

The Apostolic Delegate then recalled the practice of the Eastern Church to turn to Peter living in his successors, to the Bishop of Rome, for judgment in matters of faith and episcopal affairs. "But," he said, "a bitter wall of separation was coming into being; differences in the concept of the organization of the Church, sharpness of dogmatic disputes, national animosity, ethnic changes contributed to this separation; then interests foreign to religion and the passage of time solidified it, and now we are pained to find ourselves in such a state among brothers."

After referring to the great solicitude of the Holy Father for a return to unity, he said, "It is the obligation of each and every one to work for

the return to unity. . . . If we know and love each other better, a vast field of apostolate will unfold before us where prayer, sublime example of charity, love and mutual cooperation will produce marvelous results."

He then referred to the Chair of Unity Octave, and the fact that several religious Orders have instituted Oriental branches. But all should resolve to take part in this apostolate of unity through prayer, study, charity, with material and moral assistance.

He sketched the progress of the Ukrainian Catholics in America, under the leadership of the Most Rev. Constantine Bohachevsky who had ruled the Apostolic Exarchate of the United States for 28 years, and of his Auxiliary, Bishop Ambrose Sensyshin. "Be glad," he said, "in seeing the panorama contructed by your father and yourselves: 153 parishes established here and there in 22 of these United States; more than 60 parochial schools; five high schools, two colleges, three orphanages, three old-folks homes, a Ukrainian Catholic press, a rich flowering of religious, cultural, and welfare organizations, a minor Seminary in Stamford, Conn., and finally this Major Seminary in Washington, bearing the glorious and beloved name of your Patron, St. Josaphat, Bishop and Martyr." He closed with a request to join in prayer that the Seminary, serving 313,000 faithful with their more than 300 priests would be "a new bond of close union and fraternal love."

Associate Rector of Episcopal Church Resigns

The Rev. William C. Kernan, assistant rector of the Protestant Episcopal Church of St. James the Less in Scarsdale, N.Y., has resigned his post with the intention of entering the Catholic Church. He is married, and the father of four sons and two daughters. He is a graduate of Yale University and the General Theological Seminary.

Comments of Former Catholic Chaplain at Moscow

In speaking to the Wisconsin Catholic Action convention at Milwaukee, the Rev. Leopold Braun, A.A., chaplain at the Church of St. Louis at Moscow from 1934 to 1945, remarked, "Faith in Russia exists very much in the hearts of the people and Soviet youth has a developed thirst for Christian learning." He finds that they are mentally curious; among the youth interest in Christian teaching follows upon the discovery that they have been deceived. They had been taught that nothing but "imperial Russia" was important, and had been indoctrinated in dialectical materialism and communism, that is to say, in an intellectual vacuum and embracing an empty cause. According to Fr. Braun, the dreams of the Russian youth crumbled with the crumbling of the Russian Army during the last war. Since the war, the youth have seen the religion of other nations, and have begun to ask questions on immortality and church doctrine.

Street Preaching in Protestant South

Rev. Dr. John A. O'Brien research professor of philosophy of religion at the University of Notre Dame, and noted author, regularly spends his summer "vacation" doing street preaching. This year, after two weeks of street preaching in the region of Jacksonville, N.C., he reported that 40 persons had begun taking instruction in the Catholic Faith. There is not a single native adult Catholic in a total population of 100,000. (NC)

Significant Reflection on Barcelona Congress

In a radio broadcast giving a report on the Eucharistic Congress of Barcelona, the Very Rev. Robert I. Gannon, former president of Fordham University, remarked that just as Catholic Hungary prayed for Spain during the International Eucharistic Congress in 1938, so did Spain pray for Hungary during the recent Barcelona Congress. At that time Barcelona was the capital of communism in Spain. A mass ordination of some 840 priests took place at the Barcelona Congress where in 1938 priests were being bound and shot by Communists. (NC)

* * * *

COLUMBIA

Alleged Persecution of Protestants

The *Osservatore Romano* of July 7 published a notice on the reports of religious persecution in Columbia. It refers to two articles printed in the *New York Times* of June 21 under one heading: one was an account of the Holy Father's Letter to the Catholics of Colombia, in which he invited them to cease the internal strife of their country, and to work for universal peace. The other contained information on Colombia obtained by "Protestant groups in the United States," according to which the people have been troubled by religious disturbances since 1949, that there have been numerous acts of violence and persecution of Protestants, and these, according to what they have been told, would have been provoked by the attitude of the Catholic Hierarchy.

The *Osservatore* points out that this presentation of the Holy Father's Letter gives the false impression that his invitation to concord envisaged the supposed religious strife, whereas it is clearly intended to refer to strife of a political nature. Moreover, the report of persecution of Protestants at the instigation of the Catholic Hierarchy is by no means in accord with the truth. *The Osservatore* says:

"Indeed the truth is that Protestant propaganda is being carried on with an intense campaign derogatory to the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholics of Colombia." *The Bulletin of the Colombian Evangelical Confederation* directed by Luis A. Quiroga, in successive numbers has insisted upon this campaign in wholly arbitrary reports, which are reprinted in the newspapers and weeklies of the United States.

Information gathered by Catholics show that the state of affairs is quite different from that described by this *Bulletin.* However, the hierarchy has found itself obliged to "put the faithful on their guard against the dangers of heresy, but has never in the slightest way encouraged acts of violence against the persons of Protestants."

On the other hand, the *Osservatore* notes, because of the political situation, the Protestants have aligned themselves with parties of opposition. The strife of which they complain has to do not with their religious faith but with the political parties to which they belong.

The NCWC News Service gives further clarifications. It reports that two articles published in *Presbuterian Life* show results of investigations carried out in Colombia by Mr. Henry L. McCorkle, according to which many acts of violence against Protestant persons and institutions have occurred.

He says, "Despite many utterances about peace and unity, the Roman Church has deliberately courted unrest and disunity."

A more recent instance of misleading reports was issued in June by the *Confederation of Evangelical Churches of Colombia.* It charged that the aggressive attitude toward Protestants was "inspired by the anti-Protestant pronouncements of leaders like Bishop Miguel Angelo Builes of Santa Rosa de Oses."

The NCWS News Service has made an examination of the matter, and finds that the accusations rest upon a two-fold error: First, it is erroneously asserted that many acts of violence in that strife-ridden country are designed mainly to "exterminate" the Protestant minority. Secondly, it is falsely stated that acts of violence suffered by Protestants have been *"instigated"* by the Catholic hierarchy in that country.

It must be kept in mind that since the abortive leftist revolution of April, 1948, there has been a deplorable chain of violence in Colombia. The existence of this violence has been recognized by His Holiness Pope Pius XII, who recently made a direct appeal for fraternity and unity among the Colombian people; the Colombian Bishops have also issued a pastoral letter appealing for a halt "to the dreadful crimes of blood and destruction."

The strife is mainly political in nature. It rages between the Liberals and the Conservatives, and its victims include both Catholics and Protestants. The Conservative party is generally regarded there as more favorable to the Catholic Church. The Liberal party, which has often shown itself anti-clerical, has generally received the support of the Protestant minority.

Charges reported in the United States that all Protestants who are victims of violence suffer for the sole reason that they are Protestants constitute a distortion of the facts. It would be just as false to assert that all Catholics who have suffered violence—and there have been many cases, including priests—suffered because of their Catholicism. The motive for these acts of violence is mainly political, and not religious.

It is a fact that the Bishops have issued pastorals pointing out to the faithful the doctrinal errors of Protestantism, and the necessity of guarding against Protestant propaganda. As guardians of the faith, they are obliged in duty to make such warnings. However, there have never been any pastorals or pronouncements by the Bishops urging violence against the Protestant minority; it is a grave injustice to the Catholic Hierarchy to accuse them of "inspiring" such acts.

To cite an illustrative case, a leading Washington newspaper printed an editorial in the form of an advertisement in which such a charge was made. The editorial had originally appeared in *El Nacional* of Barranqilla, Colombia. It referred to "a frightful church circular of the Bishop of Santa Rosa recommending the extermination of anti-Catholics including among the anti-Catholics the Colombian Liberal Party." On being advised of this editorial by the N.C.W.C. News Service correspondent, Bishop Miguel Angelo Builes of Santa Rosa sent the following telegram to the director of *El Nacional*:

"I have just read . . . a reproduction of your editorial attributing to me pastorals recommending the extermination of all anti-Catholics, including the Colombian Liberal party, and consequently Protestant ministers. I formally challenge you to publish any document of mine proving this charge of your paper . . ."

The paper did not respond to the Bishop's challenge, but resorted to a

statement in an editorial that "we have never said that Bishop Builes had ordered the burning of Protestant churches or the killing of their ministers."

The Protestants who rightfully deplore the acts of violence which have occurred, may confidently expect that when the political unrest of Colombia is pacified the supposed symptoms of religious persecution will disappear.

* * * *

FRANCE

New Minor Seminary for Ukrainians

A Minor Seminary of St. John Bosco at Loury (Orleans) for the education of Ukrainian candidates to the priesthood was solemnly inaugurated on June 29. Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, and His Excellency Archbishop Roncalli, Apostolic Nuncio to France, were present. A Pontifical Liturgy was celebrated on this occasion by Bishop John Bucko, Apostolic Visitor for Ukrainians in Western Europe.

The new Seminary, with the annexed agricultural school, was made possible through substantial contributions from the Oriental Congregation and various individual benefactors. It will be under the care of the Salesian Fathers, and marks the creation of a new Oriental rite branch in this religious Congregation. Nevertheless the Salesian Fathers are not altogether new in the Oriental field since they already have schools in Egypt, Palestine, and Iran.

The Seminary will receive, for the present time, 50 candidates for the priesthood who have been attending the Diocesan Seminary of Orleans.

The Ukrainians who have found refuge in various countries of Western Europe number about 100,000. The largest groups are in France (about 45,000,) in England (about 30,000,) in Germany (about 20,000,) and in Beligium (about 5,000.) (SICO)

* * * *

SPAIN

College for Refugee Students

There are 15 students from 12 Communist-dominated countries attending the *Colegio Mayor de Santiago Apostole*, a college for refugees established at Madrid five years ago. Dr. Jose Cieker, director of the school, says that memories of a common danger have brought about among them "a real solidarity which unites them under the Sign of the Cross." There has never been the slightest friction among the students.

The college started with a group of 18 young Ukrainians. Today 11 other countries are represented: Poland, Croatia, Czechoslovakia, Serbia, Estonia, Slovenia, Georgia, Hungary, Rumania, White Russia, and China. (NC)

* * * *

GERMANY

Probst Asmussen Resigns from Lutheran Ecumenical Council

Probst (Dean) Hans Asmussen has withdrawn his membership in the Ecumenical Council of the German Evangelical Church. In a letter addressed to the Council he gave as reason his conviction that the direction and in-

terpretation given to the Evangelical (Lutheran) Church's Foreign Affairs by Pastor Niemoeller is of such a nature that he and his friends are unable to further collaborate. He says: "At Stuttgart, in 1945, we declared ourselves guilty of having kept silence too long. Today there reigns a greater silence in the Churches of Western Germany, under Niemoeller's influence, than ever in the Third Reich. The Soviet System is minimized; our imprisoned brethren in the East are being passed over in silence and forgotten. No one knows even their names and numbers. In the struggle against the 'German Christians' (Protestants under Nazi-controlled direction) we fought against a political theology. The danger of a political theology is no less today. We Germans want peace and the unity of Germany, but those desires are being turned into a pseudo-theology."

In the opinion of Probst Asmussen, Niemoeller's political theology is in line with the policy of Hromadka in Czechoslovakia, and of some Protestants in Hungary, and tends to prepare the way for Communist domination.

Probst Asmussen's resignation takes place against the background of considerable tension among German Lutherans with regard to the function of religion in political affairs, and specifically with regard to the question of contribution to German defence. After a recent meeting with President Adenauer, ten West German Lutheran Church Presidents declared that it was not befitting that the Church should give an answer to the political question of whether or not a defence contribution was advisable. In this, Bishop Dibelius, Chairman of the Council of the German Lutheran Church was of the same mind. Pastor Niemoeller, as Church President of Hessen, along with the Church President of Rhineland, Rhinepfalz, and Westphalia, refused to subscribe to this declaration. (*Echo der Zeit*)

* * * *

SWITZERLAND

Inter-confessional Celebration at Romainmotier

The fifteen hundredth anniversary of the establishment of Christianity was celebrated at Romainmotier on the Feast of Sts Peter and Paul in the ancient abbey church dedicated to these apostles. The edifice has been used as a church for Protestants of the Reform since the 16th century.

According to the desires of the organizing committee, and through the considerate tact of the Pastor Amadeus Dubois, the anniversary celebration was carried out in a spirit of great friendship and serenity. The programme was arranged in such wise that representatives of the Catholic hierarchy could be present. An impressive service solemnized with fine choral singing took place. Assisting were the Chancellor of the Helvetian Confederation, the civil and religious authorities, the Catholic representation, the Deaconesses of Saint Loup, and the Brothers of the Protestant religious Community of Taizé-les-Cluny, and others, besides a tremendous congregation of faithful come from the Canton of Vaud and nearby cantons. The Catholic participants were Bishop Glusin of St. Claude, the Very Rev. Fr. Prior of Hauterive who represented Bishop Charrière of Fribourg, and Canon Galloy, representing Archbishop Dubourg of Besancon.

During the function, Brother Rober Schutz, founder and first Brother of the Taizé community read the celebrated Chapter XVI of St. Matthew containing the lines most appropriate for the feast: "Thou art Peter, and

upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it."

The Pastor Dubois gave a discourse that expressed a great longing for Christian unity. We quote a passage:

"Romainmotier bears in the very stones of its sanctuary the visible marks of the rift that divided Christianity in the 16th century. There are few place where the longing for lost unity makes itself felt more urgently. The obstacles to the union of all Christians in one sole flock, in one great family of united brothers, not only invisible, but also in a visible way, seem insurmountable. What then can we do? Work up-stream with all our might: dissipate the hatred, prejudices and distrust which separate us; enter into contact, and pray much one for another. But one does not travel against the current without arousing reactions and without upsetting ancient habits . . . Our church of Romainmotier owes it to itself to be a living center of ecumenical work." He exhorted the hearers to reflect upon what the past has to teach, and cited St. Paul: "Therefore let us also, having such a cloud of witnesses over us, put away every encumbrance and the sin entangling us, and run with patience to the fight set before us; looking towards the author and finisher of faith, Jesus."

Christian worship had begun at Romainmotier about the year 450 when St. Romain and his brother St. Lupicin came from the monastery of St. Claude to found the first church in the forests of the Nozon valley. This first community was destroyed by the Alamans. Disciples of St. Colomban of Ireland built the second church. A third church was consecrated by the Pope himself; he dedicated it to the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul. In 959 Adelaide of Bourgogne ceded the Abbey to the Monks of Cluny, who built the splendid Romanesque church which still stands today.

During the 16th century the Protestant Reformers from Berne pillaged the monastery, destroyed the altars, broke the windows, mutilated the statues, and covered the wall-paintings with a coat of lime; the narthex was converted into a granary.

The present abbey church was restored with great care by the civil authorities between 1898 and 1915.

* * * *

RUSSIA

Impressions of a Danish Pastor

When interviewed by the Danish "Kristeligt Dagblad," Pastor Johansen, who had been the guest of VOKS, a cultural organization in the Soviet Union, and also of the dissident Russian Church, said among other things: "I took part in several services and there are quite a few of them. In Moscow alone there are two-hour long services in 55 churches three times a day. The church direction told me that on ordinary Sundays some 225,000 people out of a population of about 7,000,000 go to church." Daily Masses are celebrated; services are held in the evening as well. (EPS)

* * * *

ALBANIA

"National Catholic Church"

The Communist government in Albania has established a "National Catholic Church," described as subject to divine law, the laws of the country

and to canon laws which are not contrary to Albanian civil law and public order; it should have no administrative, economic, and political relations with the Holy See. An archbishop is recognized, who alone may have contact with ecclesiastics abroad, and these through Government channels. Bishops may not ordain priests except in accordance with the civil laws. Clerical nominations and changes may not be made without the consent of a diocesan council. We have not learned if this institution has taken on any considerable proportions.

* * * *

BULGARIA

State Church

The Communist government of Bulgaria has declared the Orthodox Church to be the State Church, "so long as it remains in the true people's democratic spirit."

* * * *

CHALDEAN CHURCH

Consecration of Archbishop Zayia Dachtou

An episcopal consecration took place for the first time in the new Cathedral of the Chaldeans at Teheran. In January, His Excellency Zayia Dachtou, Archbishop of Urmia and Bishop of Salmos, was consecrated according to the Chaldean rite by Archbishop Joseph Cheikho of Sena. It was through the zeal of the latter that the Cathedral, a genuine work of art, had been constructed.

The Octave day of Christmas was chosen for the ceremony to give occasion for the greatest possible participation of the faithful since it is a feast-day observed with special solemnity among the Chaldeans. The Cathedral was filled, not only with Christians of Chaldean rite and of other rites; dissident Christians were also present as well as Mohammedans who were represented by civil authorities.

Archbishop Zayia Dachtou was born at Khosrowa, Iran, in 1912, entered the Patriarchal Seminary of Mossul at 16 years, and went to Rome for studies at the Propaganda Fide in 1931. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1938 and returned to his homeland with a Doctorate in Sacred Theology. He exercised his ministry in the regions near the border line of the Soviet Union, until he was made Secretary to his Bishop, and then Vicar General. In 1951 the Patriarch of the Chaldeans appointed him Patriarchal Administrator of the Archdiocese of Urmia and Salmos.

* * * *

MALABAR

Malabar Priest appointed to Oriental Congregation

Fr. Placid, T.O.C.D. of the Syro-Malabar rite, has been appointed as consultor to the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church. It is probably the first time that an Indian priest has received such an appointment.

Fr. Placid is known in India as an expert in oriental canon law, and the history of the Catholic Church in Malabar. (NC)

JORDANIA

Cardinal Agagianian Dedicates Armenian Church

In May His Eminence Gregory Peter XV Agagianian, Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians, dedicated a new church for Armenian rite Catholics at Amman in Jordania. The church is named in honour of Our Lady of the Assumption. In his sermon he expressed deep gratitude to the American benefactors of the Catholic Near East Welfare Association who had offered the funds for the building of the church, school and rectory.

Among those receiving the Cardinal were Archbishop Gustave Testa, Apostolic Delegate to Jordan, Greek Catholic Archbishop Michael Assaf, Msgr. Nemeh Simaan, Vicar General of the Latin Patriarch in East Jordan, Msgr. George Gamsaragan, rector of the new Armenian parish, representatives of the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land, and many civil diplomatic and military representatives. At a reception following the dedication, the Cardinal was greeted by both Catholic and dissident Armenians.

On this occasion he had an audience with King Talal I who spoke of the deep impression his recent audience with Pope Pius XII had made upon him. (NC)

* * * *

EGYPT

Millenary Celebration of the Library at Alexandria

November 16, 17, and 18, 1952, have been fixed to celebrate the millenary of the *Library of the Greek Orthodox Patriarchate of Alexandria.* The organizing committee, nominated by His Beatitude Christophoros II, dissident Patriarch of Alexandria and All Africa, has asked libraries all over the world to contribute articles or other studies to the commemorative volume to be published on this occasion. There will be a competition on the subject, "The Period in Egypt between the Oak Council of Chalcedon in 403 A.D. and the Fourth Ecumenical Council of Chalcedon in 451." Three prizes will be awarded.

The library of the Patriarchate carries on the tradition of the great Ptolemic Libraries. Its codes and decretals were studied by such great Patriarchs as Athanasius and Cyril; it had in its possession the Codex Alexandrinus. (EPS)

Book Reviews

RUSSIAN SPIRITUALITY and THEOLOGY

An Analytic and Systematic Survey of Works Published In Recent Years[1]

After the fall of Constantinople, Moscow assumed the role of "Third Rome." She made her own the glorious religious heritage of Byzantium and continued its spiritual traditions. The spirituality which flourished in the Russan monasteries, in the northern forests or the sourthern steppes, despite certain Slavic colourings, is not substantially different from the Byzantine type. Russian religious thought and theology did not follow the same path. Theology was affected by Latin inspiration with the school of Kiev in the 17th century, and underwent Protestant influence with Theophane Procopovitch in the 18th century. Finally, in the 19th century, the influence of German philosophic idealism with Khomiakov and Soloviev predominated. We shall, then, examine successively spirituality and religious thought in connection with the literature published on these matters in recent years.

RUSSIAN SPIRITUALITY

1. G.P. Fedotov, *A Treasury of Russian Spirituality*; Sheed and Ward, London, 1950, 501 pages.

2. E. Behre-Sigel, *Prière et sainteté dans l'Eglise russe* (*Russie et Chrétienté* 5;) Editions du Cerf, Paris, 1950, 180 pages.

3. Nadejda Gorodetzky, *Saint Tikhon Zadonsky, Inspirer of Dostoevsky;* SPCK, London, 1951. xi-249 pages. Cf. Tyszkiewics, OCP XVIII (1952) pp. 211-215.

4. *Russische Frommigkeit: Briefe eines Starzen.* Aus dem russischen Uebersetze, eingeleitet und herusgegeben von Nickolai von Bubnoff. Metopenverlag, Wiesbaden, 1947, 178 pages.

5. *Writings from the Philokalia on Prayer of the Heart,* translated by E. Kadloubovsky and G.H.E. Palmer; Faber and Faber, London, 1951, 420 pages.

Professor Fedotov (1887-1951) was beyond question one of the best scholars of Russian hagiography. He taught this subject for 15 years at the Orthodox Institute of Paris (1925-1940,) and for 10 more years at St. Vladimir's in New York. It is usually acknowledged that it was his way to give such emphasis to the characteristics of the Slav and Russian soul in the Russian saints[2] that he failed to note the traditional and Byzantine characteristics which persisted as the fundamental note of their spirituality. His *Treasury of Russian Spirituality* (1) reveals this tendency. In this collection Fedotov presents a gallery of saints with well defined national traits: St. Theodosius, St. Sergius, Avvakum, Tikhon of Zakonsk, and Seraphim of Sarvov, the Pilgrim, John of Kronstadt, and finally, for the contemporaneous period, P.A. Yelchaninov, who died at Paris in 1934. It is to be regretted that he

[1]) Key to Abbreviations:
ZKTh—Zeitschrift fuer Katholische Theologie, Vienna.
OCP—Orientalia Christiana Periodica, Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome.
NRTh—Nouvelle Revue Theologique, Louvaine.

[2]) The words *saint* and *sanctity* are used here according to the viewpoint of the Russian writers discussed.

omitted Theophane the Recluse, who, according to the author is an unoriginal compiler of the *Philokalia*. Something of an equivalent of this work in French is to be had in the book of Mme. Behr-Sigel (2.) Unfortunately, Russian spiritual texts are wanting in French. Excepting for the rude *Vie d'Avvakum par lui-meme* which we owe to Mr. Mascal, and the *Réctis du Pélerin*, in the translation of Jean Gauvain, there is nothing. Translations into English are the most numerous, and these, by the way, have recently been further enriched by that very precious text, *The Philokalia* (5.) The Germans know the letters of Theophane the Recluse (1815-1894) in the excellent presentation of von Bubnoff (4.) The letters are divided in two groups: spiritual doctrine, and spiritual direction. Ascetics and mysticism that are opened up to us in these texts are not in contrast to occidental spirituality, whatever be the opinion of the editor in his introduction.

Still closer to us than Theophane is St. Tikhon of Zadonsky (3.) The title given here could be misleading. It is not at all a literary study on the portraits of Tikhon in the work of Dostoievsky, but is the life of a saint, written according to the requirements of history and of piety. It is comforting to find in the midst of the 18th century, when the official church had fallen into a sort of paralysis as consequence of the Ecclesiastical Ruling (1721,) such a living figure as Tikhon (1724-1783,) friend of the rule, protector of the poor, a man of the church. Today he has been somewhat forgotten. The *Prayer of Jesus*, the joy of the resurrection, the ecstatic gifts, and sophianic speculation, are left quite without support in Tikhon's spirituality, since he tends to approach the evangelical school of St. Basil or of St. John Chrysostom. Dostoievsky's ideal of the monk is widely different from the model that he chose to follow. However, it is a usual thing for a genius to project his personal conceptions upon the lives of his heroes.

RELIGIOUS THOUGHT

Khomiakov and Soloviev stand at the beginning of the Russian religious reawakening. The former has gained a position of esteem for his new philosophy of the Church, an organism living from charity and truth. The latter belongs at the origin of sophianic speculations. *Sobornost* and *Sophia Premoudrost Bogiei* are the two poles around which Russian contemporaneous speculation gravitates. In dealing with this vast field, we are classifying the works under four headings: General studies, Soloviev, Bulgakov, and Berdiaev.

General Studies

1. George Florovsky, *Les voies de la théologie russe,* Dieu Vivant, 13, 1950, pp. 41-62.

2. Archpriest V. Zenkovskij, *History of Russian Philosophy,* (in Russian) YMCA Press, Paris, 1949-1950, 2 vols. pp. 469 and 477.

3. Bernhard Schultze, S.J., *Russische Denker: Ihre Stellung zu Christus, Kirche und Papsttum*; Herder Verlag, Vienna, 1950, 456 pages.

4. S.L. Frank, *Light in Shadow: Essay on Christian Ethics and Social Philosophy.* (in Russian;) YMCA Press, Paris 1949, 403 pages.

5. Simon Frank, *Le Royaume de Dieu et le "monde";* Dieu Vivant 17, 1950, pp. 17-34.

6. Bernhard Schultze, S.J., *Die Socialprinzipien in der russischen Religionsphilosophie,* ZKTh LXXIII, 1951, pp. 385-423.

7. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., *Moralistes de Russie* (articles in OCP 1949-1951) Rome 1951, 202 pp.

8. Ludolf Mueller, *Die Kritik des Protestantismus in der russischen Theologie vom* 16. *bis zum* 18. *Jahrhundert* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literature in Mainz, Geistes–und sozialwissenschaftliche Klasse 1951) 93 pages.

9. Ludolf Meller, *Russischer Geist und evangelisches Christentum. Die Kritik des Protestantismus in der russischen religiosen Philosophie und Dichtung im* 19. *und* 20. *Jahrhundert.* Luther-Verlag, Witten Ruhr, 1951, 178 pages.

10. Prof. Preot. D. Stanisloae, *Patriarhul Serghie al Moscovai ca teolog, Ortodoxia* (organ of the Romanian Patriarchate.) I (1949) pp. 173-186.

11. Metropolitan Eulogius, *The Way of My Life. Memoirs of the Metropolitan Eulogius presented by T. Manoukhina according to conversations of the author* (in Russian;) YMCA Press, Paris, 1947, in 8°, 678 pages.

The book of Fr. Florovsky, 15 years after its appearance, still remains the best general study on Russian theology. For a long time now we have been given to hope that French and German translations would be forthcoming. They are all the more indispensable since the original Russian edition has long been out of print. The chapter printed in *Dieu Vivant* (1) is the last chapter of the book–the conclusions. The thesis of the author may thus be resumed: The Russian Church is a Church of Byzantine tradition. The cryptocatholicism of Peter Mogila and the declared "Protestantism" of Theophane Procopovitch are trends that have broken away from this tradition and do not fit into the living pattern of Russian thought. In the 19th century, along side the praisworthy reactions such as those of Philaret and of Khomiakov, there was an invasion of German philosophy. Especially, along with Soloviev, there is no other salvation for Russian theology than to return to the Greek Fathers, and build up a defense of Hellenic philosophy to confront heterogeneous systems that have been grafted onto the trunk of tradition.

The history of philosophy by Zenkovsky, (2) contains valuable information on religious thought and its proponents. The work of Fr. Schultze is one of the essential publications amidst the flood of writings dealing with Russia that has been produced within the last 30 years (3.) It has been said that his *a priorism* (consisting in a search for what a certain author has said of the Pope, of the Church, or of Christ) kept him from understanding the systems of the very diverse thinkers, among whom are some who are completely unacquainted with this concern. In our opinion, there is more *a priorism* in the criticism than there is in the work of the author. In reading his works, one feels throughout that he is not only one of the most enlightened western scholars of Russian literature, but that he is also an author who, with undisguised sympathy, attempts to reconstruct the thought of others in its dramatic development. It could be that the Roman question was foreign to some of the authors, or perhaps badly understood by them, but to be sure, they must all face the problem of Christ, and finally choose for or against Him. The collection of authors that he studies is of incomparable richness. We are surprised, nevertheless, not to find anything on Simeon Loudvigovitch Frank (1877-1950,) one of the most faithful disciples of Soloviev, and one

who, in a work of great originality, has sought to find what the conduct of a Christian and of the Church should be in the midst of the evil of this world (IV.)

The religious and the social problem are the two major problems of Russian philosophic and religious literature. In a work that could complete his vast study, Fr. Schultze extracts from this literature some fundamental social principles: unity, love, justice, solidarity, mutual-support. (6)

It often happens that the moral and juridical character of western Christianity is contrasted with the love and vital impulse that animate Oriental spirituality. Fr. Tyszkiewicz has had no difficulty in discovering an imposing series of Russian moralists, not only among the authors who have undergone western influence, be it Catholic (Peter Mogila, Innocent Giesel, St. Dmitry of Rostov,) or Protestant (Theophane Prokopovitch, the Metropolitans Plato and Philaret,) but as well among the saints of ancient Russia, Sergius and Nilus, and among contemporaneous authors (7.) Do these authors and their moral teachings not represent a genuine manifestation of Oriental spirituality? Are not these also a legitmate element of tradition, just as well as the spiritual masters and the mystics, and who should serve to bring their tradition closer to that of the Occident—although there are some who insist upon forcing them wider apart? Along with the author, we might hope that the Russian Orthodox Church will return to the sound doctrinal traditions of the best Russian moralists, such as Tikhon Zadonsky, and Theophane Zatvornik, for a better future for Russia and the entire world.

The works of Ludolf Mueller, from a Protestant point of view, reveal a number of traits in common with those of Fr. Schultze. In a first study (8,) he examines some fifteen anti-Protestant treatises of Russian origin. Some of the latter fail to represent correctly the positions of the Russian theology upon which they pretend to be based. The second study passes beyond the strict limits of theology. The Russian authors of the 19th and 20th centuries are given a hearing: the period of Alexander I, the first religious movement of the 19th century, Tchaadaev, Pouschkine, Tolstoi, and the Slavophiles. Finally there are the theorists of *Sobornost*: Berdiaev, Arseniev, Boulgakov, Florovsky. With regard to these last, the author examines principally the notion of the Church, and is pleased to find certain fundamental principles cherished by Protestantism, such as the criticism of institutions, and the negation of a functional infallibility. Only the *Sobornost* (the ecclesiastic community) is "catholic," and the authors are Protestant. In this opinion the author express only a half-truth, because the Orthodox theologians have no desire to be separated from the "Catholic" Sobornost.

One finds fascinating details on this group of theologians and the school they formed in the Memoirs of the Metropolitan Eulogius of Paris (11.) One also finds the history of that prelate's tribulations; his struggles with events and persons, the realization of a great work in the foundation of the Institute of Orthodox Theology of St. Sergius at Paris, and the labour of keeping the Orthodox Church in Europe free of all political entanglements, be they of the right or of the left. True, there are those who criticise him for not having been able to keep Orthodox doctrine free from philosophic or Protestant influences. The Metropolitan Sergius of Moscow, who was at once both his friend and his enemy, is presented as the vigilant guardian of this Orthodoxy, notably in the two quarrels of these last decades on the

Soteriology of Anthony Khrapovski, and the Sophianism of Bulgakov (10) in a study that appeared in a theological review of the Romanian Patriarchate.

VLADIMIR SOLOVIEV (1853-1900)

1. Vladimir Soloviev, *Conscience de la Russie;* Traduit et présenté par Jean Gauvain. Plon, Paris, 1950, 188 pages.

2. Wl. Solowjow, *Drei Gespraeche: Uebersetzung, Nachwort und Erlaueterungen von Erich Mueller-Kamp;* Bonn, Goetz Schwippert-Verlag, 1947.

3. *A. Solovyov, Anthology,* edited by S. L. Frank; S.M.C. Press, London, 1950, in 8°, 268 pages.

4. K.V. Motschoulskij, *Vladimir Soloviev* (in Russian;) 2nd edition, YMCA Press, Paris, 1951, 286 pages.

5. Bernhard Schultze, S.J., *Solowjev und Dostojewsky,* OCP XV, 1949, pp. 202-207.

6. A. Paplauskas-Ramunas, *Vladimir Soloviev: Le pont vivant entre la Russie orthodoxe et Rome,* 1900-1950; Review of the University of Ottawa, XX, 1950, pp. 343-374.

7. Heinrich Falk, S.J., *Posicion de Vladimir Soloviev respecto a la Iglesia Catolica, Oriente* I, 1951, pp. 103-116.

8. W. Szylkarski, *Solowjews Stellung zur Katolischen Kirche,* OCP, XVI, 1950, pp. 5-38.

9. Ludolf Mueller, *Solowjew und der Protestantismus; Mit einem Anhang Solowjew und das Jundentum,* Nachwort von W. Skylkarski, Bonn, 1951, 182 pages.

10. S. Tyszkiewicz, S.J., *L'ascension spirituelle de Wenceslas Ivanov,* NRTh, LXXII, 1950, pp. 1050-1062.

Under the headings, Dostoievsky and the vocation of Russia, Poland and Russia, the Russian problem, Orient and Occident, the meaning of history (account of the Antichrist,) Jean Gauvain has assembled the texts in which the thought of Soloviev is expressed on the Church and the history of the world (1.) Frank's collection draws to a greater extent from the philosophical writings of Soloviev (3.) The German version is limited to the *Therr Conversations* (2.) Thanks to the French, English and German texts, this philosopher is becoming better and better known. After Professor Szylkarsky of Bonn, Fr. Schultze returns to the question of relations between Soloviev and Dostoievsky. The former admits that Dostoievsky has found the theme of the Grand Inquisitor, or more precisely the interpretation of the account of Temptation with relation to the history of the Church in the *Lessons on the Theandrism of Soloviev* (1878.) According to Soloviev, in fact, Catholicism has succumbed to the will of power, Protestantism to pride of spirit, and materialism to the pride of the flesh. Fr. Schultze thinks that one finds the elements of this exegesis in the work of Dostoievsky well before 1878, particularly in *The Idiot* which dates from 1866 to 1867 (V.)

The personal case of Soloviev continues to be debated. Motschoulskij (4) believes that at the moment of his death, Soloviev understood that before the reunion of the Churches should be achieved, nobody could be at the same time both Orthodox and Catholic. This conclusion of the author is

based upon the revelations of Kolosov on the subject of the confession and the penitence of Soloviev, a surprising account published ten years after the event. According to him, Soloviev admitted his proud obstinateness on the point of dogma, and his resistence to the priest who had received his confession three years before. In her *Contemporary Memoirs,* Mme. Ieltzova Lopatina affirms that as a matter of fact, three years before his death, Soloviev had called Fr. Ivantsov-Platonov to him. After he left, Soloviev appeared extremely sad. These affirmations can only be fictitious in view of the fact that Fr. Ivantsov Platonov died in 1894, or six years before the death of Soloviev. The latter died faithful to the Roman Church since after his confession to the priest of the Orthodox Church, he lived two weeks longer without making any sign to those about him of a change in his attitude.

Ludolf Mueller, who is actively concerned with finding Protestant influences in Russian Orthodoxy, has devoted an entire volume to the case of Soloviev. In his last period, dating from 1889 to his death, the author finds that he professed the religion of the Holy Ghost, rising above the dogmatism and the practices of the three Christian confessions. Soloviev would then have thought that the Christian Church was not realized by any of the three existing confessions, but that it would only be realized in the future through a union of these three, in the best of what each had to offer. There is some foundation for these ideas: at the end of his life, Soloviev had lost the antipathy that he had in the years 1884-1888 with regard to the Orthodox Church; he also looked more favorably upon the interior religion of Protestantism. Nevertheless, his preferences and his fidelity remained constant with the Catholic Church. It was in 1896 that Soloviev formally embraced Catholicism, and in his last writing, *The Three Conversations,* we find that the union of the Churches would come about through the recognition of the Roman primacy on the part of Orthodoxy and Protestantism. Soloviev, without leaving the Oriental Church, wished to become a member of the Catholic Church. He had disciples along this path. A number of Catholic Russians, such as the great thinker Wenceslaus Ivanov (10) claimed to be his followers in their religious attitude. A. Wenger, A.A.

(To be Concluded)